DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 944 HE 009 730

AUTHOR Francis, J. Bruce
TITLE To Break the Chain...The Goodrich Scholarship Program, University of Nebraska at Omaha. An Evaluation.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 144p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attrition (Research Studies); Curriculum; Economically Disadvantaged; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Workload; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Low Income Groups; *Program Evaluation; *Scholarships; Student Characteristics; *Student Financial Aid; Student Teacher Relationship; Teaching Techniques
IDENTIFIERS *Goodrich Scholarship Program; University of Nebraska Omaha

ABSTRACT

The Goodrich Scholarship Program for low-income students at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, its impact on students, and its strengths and weaknesses, are evaluated. Of the 350 students who have enrolled since 1972 under the Goodrich Program, 194 are currently enrolled, 28 have graduated, and the remainder have withdrawn at one stage or another before completion of the allotted four years. Student characteristics, academic performance, attrition rates, and Goodrich graduates are discussed. The Goodrich faculty, its workload, teaching techniques, attitudes toward teaching, and acceptance by the students are described. The curriculum established for Goodrich students is evaluated and case histories demonstrating the use or nonuse of the Study Skills Center are provided. The organizational structure through which the Goodrich program is administered is described as well as the evaluation procedures. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150944

The Goodrich Scholarship Program

University of Nebraska at Omaha

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Bruce Francis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

An Evaluation by

J. Bruce Francis, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

1977

arg action research associates

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 009 730

TO BREAK THE CHAIN . . .

THE GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

AN EVALUATION

by

J. Bruce Francis, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE GOODRICH STUDENT 7

II. GOODRICH FACULTY 20

III. THE CURRICULUM 32

IV. THE ORGANIZATION 54

V. SUMMARY, ISSUES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 63

APPENDIX A: PROCEDURES OF THE EVALUATION 74

APPENDIX B: TABLES OF RESULTS 88

APPENDIX C: GOODRICH GRADUATES 114

REFERENCES 124

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Race and Sex of Goodrich Students 89

1.2 Comparative Grading Performance of Goodrich Students in Non-Goodrich Courses 1974-1976 90

1.3 Comparative Grading Performance of Goodrich Students in Non-Goodrich Courses 91

1.4 Comparative Scores on Cornell Learning and Study Skills Inventory--College Form 92

1.5 Comparison of Performance on Critical Reasoning Tests, December, 1975 93

1.6 Goodrich Enrollment Statistics 94

1.7 Cumulative Attrition Rates for Each Goodrich Class 95

1.8 Graduates of the Goodrich Scholarship Program 96

1.9 Selected CSQ Items Showing Students Responses Toward the Goodrich Program 97

1.10 Rank Order of Areas of Personal Satisfaction for Goodrich Students 98

1.11 Selected CSQ Items Showing Student Estimates of the Character of the Goodrich Program 99

1.12 Comparison of Alienation Questionnaire Response Percentages of 187 Goodrich (GDR) and 195 Non-Goodrich (NGDR) Students 100

2.1 Activities Analysis of Goodrich Teaching Faculty 104

2.2 College Student Questionnaire Item Responses Indicating Student Receptions of Faculty 105

3.1 Selected Values and Attitudes (CSQ) of Freshman and Sophomore Goodrich Students 106

3.2 Selected Attitudes of Goodrich Freshman and Sophomore Students 107

4.1 Current College Affiliation of Goodrich Students (in order of frequency) 112

4.2 Comparative Expenditures of Goodrich Program, UNO, and National Average 113

"The greatest of evils and the
worst of crimes is poverty."
George Bernard Shaw, 1907

INTRODUCTION

In 1972, Senator Glenn S. Goodrich of the Nebraska Unicameral sponsored legislation that provided tuition assistance to enable low-income students to attend the University of Nebraska at Omaha. His avowed purpose was to intervene directly by means of education into the cycle of social deprivation that afflicted his urban constituents. Young people deprived by low socio-economic status of most social goods, including education, were unable to obtain the skills and knowledge necessary to achieve upward mobility. Mired in poverty, these youth married and raised families; but could not afford adequate education for their children, who then were also unable to rise socially and economically and so perpetuated for themselves and subsequent children the same cycle . . . poverty leading to poor education leading to further poverty. It was this vicious circle, this chain of poverty and deprivation that Senator Goodrich's efforts sought to break. The Program that bears his name represents the University at Omaha's execution of that legislative mandate, in a manner intended to be consistent with ideals of academic excellence which the University had decided to pursue.

That these two notions, social intervention and academic excellence, which some believe to be incompatible, should coalesce into an effective educational program with academic legitimacy and stability is, if successful, an event worth noting.

What follows is the report of an external evaluation of the Goodrich Scholarship Program, of its impact upon students, its strength and weakness, and of the issues and problems it faces. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the Program's impact on its students, to suggest which Program features account for that impact, and to make recommendations for its improvement. To accomplish this purpose the following dimensions were examined:

1. The extent to which the Program fulfills its objective of helping low-income students of heterogeneous cultures enter college and move toward successful completion.

2. The extent to which students attain academic skills and attitudes which are conducive to success in college.

3. Faculty backgrounds, skills, and attitudes that contribute to program success.

4. The role of the Goodrich curriculum and support service in contributing to student success.

5. Relationships of the Goodrich Program to the College in which it finds its administrative home and the larger University of which it is a part.

Since the program itself is complex and multi-dimensional, it was necessary to design and execute an equivalently complex and multi-dimensional evaluation. Procedures used are described in Appendix A. Several principles of evaluation guided the study, including:

1. The evaluation sought to be as comprehensive as possible given the limits of time and resources under which it was carried out.

2. The evaluation depended heavily upon detailed description from which judgments of efficiency, effectiveness, and worth are derived.

3. The evaluation was not limited to assessing whether or not the Goodrich Program met its objectives, but inquired as well into the process by which those objectives were met, and the significance and worth of both the objectives and the Program itself.

4. The evaluation made use of both qualitative and quantitative data collected from multiple sources and analyzed in different ways to yield inferences and conclusions.

5. The evaluation emphasized rigor and precision but did not adhere slavishly to traditional research methods at the cost of richness.

6. Finally, the data of this evaluation do not speak for themselves. The primary responsibility for interpretations rests with the judgment of the evaluator. In that sense the evaluation is and must be ultimately subjective; but it has sought to apply a disciplined subjectivity that is open to public review.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to an understanding and appreciation of the societal worth of the endeavor and of the concept that undergirds it.

SOCIETAL BACKGROUND

The Goodrich Scholarship Program is a collaborative effort by the Nebraska State Legislature and the University of Nebraska at Omaha to provide effective educational opportunity to low income students. Although the Program bears certain similarities to other efforts across the country to provide such opportunities, (eg. SEEK at the City University of New York), it has several distinctive features which need to be understood as background and context to the information that is to follow. The features which characterize the Program are:

1. It provides targeted direct assistance to low-income students in the form of tuition waivers.

2. It provides a special academic program of general education through studies of contemporary social problems.

3. It provides special support services for remediation of academic deficiencies of low-income students.

1. Direct Assistance to Students. A major difference between federal and state support of higher education is that federal support is usually to students directly in the form of tuition aid, while state support customarily takes the form of institutional assistance (Weathersby, 1976, p. 114). The Goodrich Program, recognizing that the institutional costs of accepting new students is inevitably greater than the amount covered by tuition waivers, provides both forms of assistance. It is the institutional assistance that provides the university with resources to establish special services that it believes are needed to make the extra opportunity effective.

In addition, the Goodrich funds are targeted to provide opportunity to low-income students only, thus differing from basic assistance to all students. This targeting accomplishes what is called in economics "focusing funds at the margin," a more efficient use of money to increase the attendance of those who, without such assistance, would most likely not enroll. In this the Goodrich Program seems to be based upon an economically efficient approach to increasing access to education.

2. Special Remediation Program. K. Patricia Cross (1976) discusses three different models of the way American higher education has responded to the problem of providing access to college opportunity. All three models sought to change an elitist tradition which characterized American higher education from its beginnings in the 17th

century until just after World War II. During its elitist phase emphasis was upon selection of those high school graduates who were believed to have the best chance of succeeding in college. Since success in college was defined in traditional academic terms and since the best indication of potential for that success was academic performance in the best high schools, many students of lower socio-economic class (particularly members of certain minority groups) were effectively barred from participation. A class structure that was unequal replicated and propagated inequality through selective access to higher education. Education beyond high school was viewed not as a right but as a privilege, and was indeed reserved to a privileged few.

After World War II a concerted attempt was made to increase opportunities whereby poverty-laden minority students could attend college. The policy of increased access was fueled by the GI Bill and was concentrated in a vast expansion of the community college system; but universities and four-year colleges opened their doors as well to a wide array of new students.

They did so, however, while adhering to basic values and concepts about education, which made it necessary to go beyond the access model. Colleges and universities accepted as students those who might not be immediately qualified in the traditional sense, but then provided special academic assistance programs to enable those students, within a reasonable period of time, to attain the same levels of performance as traditional students. This emphasis, described by Cross as a remedial model, was characterized by the growth of special student services, basic skills courses, and separate pre-college curricula to prepare students. The belief persisted that traditional academic

standards were still appropriate to all college students; but no longer was it necessary for students to be able to meet these standards before entering college. The primary shift was to making such standards required for graduation but not necessarily for entrance.

A third, more recent, and, to Cross, more advanced and desirable model of increased opportunity in higher education has been what she calls the pluralistic emphasis in which the very academic tradition and standards are no longer seen as appropriate for all students; but are seen as changing to accommodate more and more different clienteles. In this emphasis, it is not the students who change to meet traditional standards, but the institutions which modify instructional procedures, and even their organizational structures to better accommodate students who have been systematically if unintentionally excluded from college.

The Goodrich Scholarship Program is not pluralistic, but is clearly an example of Cross's remedial emphasis in which the traditional values of higher education are maintained and ways are sought to bring new clienteles into accord with them. Such a view is reflected in the stated objectives of the Program, in the attitudes of faculty and staff, and in the nature of the Goodrich curriculum. Thus the Program is designed:

a) to overcome a social ill, lack of effective access to higher education because of poverty; with

b) appropriate attention to academic excellence; and

c) with the goal of introducing students to a broadened social and cultural consciousness.

CHAPTER 1

THE GOODRICH STUDENT

Since its inception in 1972 the Goodrich Program has offered educational opportunity and special service to more than 350 students. Of these, 194 are currently enrolled, 28 have graduated, and the remainder have withdrawn at one stage or another before completion of the allotted four years.

Student Characteristics

The students who were enrolled during 1976-1977 (and who provided, for the most part, the data on which this evaluation is based) consist of a heterogenous racial/ethnic group who share, by virtue of their being in the Program, financial hardship. As shown in Table 1.1*, Afro-American and Caucasian students make up 42% and 43% of the students respectively, and females outnumber males by a substantial margin (68% to 38%). Only a relatively small proportion of Native American and Chicano students are in the Program. This is believed by many at Goodrich to be a consequence of historical discrimination in education that makes advanced education among these minorities relatively unusual and of the institutions' lack of response and inaccessibility to those minorities. There appears to be a current commitment within the

---

*All tables referred to in the text are found in Appendix B. They are numbered by chapter and consecutively within chapters. Thus, for example, Table 1.1 refers to the first table in Chapter 1.

Goodrich Program to increase the numbers and the success rate of Chicano and Native American students, but it will likely be some time before this problem (not unique to the University of Nebraska) can be overcome.

The relatively equal proportion of Caucasian-Americans and Afro-Americans and the distinct predominance of women, proportions which are both far greater than national averages, suggests that a) there is a strong relationship in American society between poverty, race, sex, and lack of educational opportunity and b) that the Goodrich Program is seeking to perform a distinct social role in redressing these long-term inequities. That similar redress of inequities with Chicano and Native American populations has not yet effectively occurred makes such efforts incomplete; and concerted action remain needed.

Academic Performance

The Program makes the assumption that with proper assistance, low-income students can succeed academically. Such success can be assessed in many ways--by grades both in Goodrich and non-Goodrich courses, by various test scores that measure potential and actual success in college work; by statistics on student attrition and by statistics on program completion.

The overall grade-point average of full-time Goodrich students at the end of academic year 1976-1977 was 2.84. Table 1.2 gives a detailed breakdown of the grades received by Goodrich students in non-Goodrich courses and Table 1.3 compares those grade totals to grades in Goodrich courses. Between 1974 and 1976 Goodrich students received appreciably better grades in Goodrich courses than in non-Goodrich

courses. One figure that may indicate some cause for concern is the percentage of withdrawals for non-Goodrich courses (16.5%) as compared with only 7.3% withdrawals from Goodrich courses. There are many interpretations possible for such a result including a greater tendency for students to not complete courses that are not required for a major, the possibility that Goodrich students do not perform as well outside the Program, or a desire to safeguard an adequate grade point average while skill development is taking place. Whichever explanation is correct, and no evidence is available to permit choice among them, still the problem of withdrawal from outside courses bears careful scrutiny.

More general evidence of the academic potential in terms of attitude of Goodrich students can be inferred from the results of the Cornell Learning and Study Skills Inventory, College form. The CLASSIC, as it is called, yields self-assessments by students of their ability in 8 different areas of academic skills and attitudes. On this instrument, given to a group during a special summer program, the Goodrich students showed themselves to be in every way similar to and consonant with average college norms. A comparison index, shown in Table 1.4, indicates no perceived deficiences in the academic self-perceptions of Goodrich students as compared with other students. Considered diagnostically, these results suggest that Goodrich students may have a slightly unrealistic idea of their skill needs, but at least an initial confidence in their ability to succeed. If such an assessment is valid and is not misinterpreted to mean that Goodrich students do not need skill development--a fact amply substantiated below--then that initial confidence can be nurtured into a more

realistic but equally confident real success. This would be an instance of the beneficial application of the so-called Rosenthal effect on self-fulfilling prophecy.

A more concrete and objective assessment of the capability of Goodrich students is suggested by comparison of their scores on a teacher-made critical reasoning test with those of students in non-Goodrich classes. As shown in Table 1.5, the only area of significant difference between the Goodrich critical reasoning classes on the one hand, and the four non-Goodrich philosophy courses teaching the same material is on Definitions. On all other skills, Goodrich students do just as well, a fact corroborated by their instructors who report that Goodrich students start out with less skill than non-Goodrich students, but close the gap over the time of their course (see below).

Retention and Completion

The goal of academic success can be indirectly assessed and it can be predicted by tests, but the real test of success is in program progress and completion. Progress is measured in negative terms by an analysis of attrition rates while completion is assessed by analysis of the program's graduates.

Table 1.6 gives a year by year breakdown of the enrollment, attrition and graduation figures for each entering class.

The attrition rates calculated year by year from these figures are shown in Table 1.7. They show that from its inception the Goodrich Program has succeeded in significantly reducing the rate of student attrition.

As reported in the 1976 accreditation Self-Study (p. 64) overall

full-time student attrition for 1974-1975 was 18.4%. Goodrich attrition during the same period was 16.7%, and in 1976-1977 dropped to 14.1%. These figures are impressive since Goodrich students are generally considered to be "higher risk" students.

Even more impressive, however, are the comparative attrition rates for Freshman. In 1974-1975, freshman attrition for UNO was 37.8% while for Goodrich freshman it was 18.4%, approximately half. This rate has been further cut in Goodrich to 11.3% in 1975-1976, and to 3.6% as of the latest though incomplete figures for 1976-1977. Preparation of this section on student attrition was hampered by the fact that data from Goodrich have only recently been integrated with general UNO student data on the University computer. The figures presented here were tabulated by hand, making sensitive comparative analyses impossible. Such studies should be carried out, however, as soon as data become available.

Since attrition occurs throughout a multi-year cycle, further information may be derived from the cumulative attrition rate which is the total accumulated number of students who withdraw divided by the total accumulated enrollment. This figure can be interpreted as the inverse of the proportion of students who continue in the program year by year from which a tentative estimate can be derived of the likelihood that a student will complete his or her degree.

It appears from Table 1.7 that for each year spent in the Goodrich Program a student's chances of withdrawing are increased by 11% to 15%. This means that fewer than 40% of the entering students are likely to get close enough to completion to graduate.

This may seem to be an unduly high attrition but must be

understood in appropriate perspective:

1. Insofar as figures are available, the Goodrich attrition rates are lower than those of the overall University.

2. Withdrawal comes after progressively more exposure to education, which in itself is good. More and more, institutions are becoming sensitive to student tendencies to interrupt their studies for a time. Such students, more appropriately called "stopouts" than "dropouts," are no longer considered to have failed. Unfortunately, current record-keeping in universities does not facilitate differentiating among reasons for attrition. As awareness grows of the importance of the distinction, it is hoped that more studies of interrupted education will be done.

3. The maintenance of educational opportunity for an extended period of time builds progressively greater likelihood of program completion. As subsequent classes have entered Goodrich, fewer and fewer dropouts are occurring. It seems reasonable to expect that developing sophistication of selection and instructional processes, as well as greater experience by the Goodrich faculty and staff with courses and antidotes to attrition, will continue to decrease the attrition figures and to increase commensurately the probability that every student will be successful.

Goodrich Graduates

As shown in Table 1.7, 1976 marked the year of the first large-scale graduation of Goodrich students. The graduates had, for the most part, entered with the first Goodrich class in 1972-1973; and had taken 9-10 semesters to complete their program. Analysis of Table 1.6 shows that by the time eight semesters had passed, 52% of those entering in 1972-1973 were still working toward their degree. Two semesters later, that percentage had dropped to 22% with 20 having graduated and 8 having withdrawn. Whether the Goodrich students will continue to take longer than the traditional eight semesters to complete their degree cannot be readily determined from available statistics, nor can it be determined whether the typical non-Goodrich student takes longer than eight semesters to finish. It does not seem

unreasonable to suppose that many UNO students, Goodrich and non-Goodrich alike, "stopout" of the university for a time during their career. Given the urban, commuter nature of the institution, such periodic forays into the world of work (if we assume that work is what students stopout for) can be seen as educationally desirable.

If one estimates that the typical Goodrich student will finish in 9-10 semesters, if at all, then the graduation of 40 students out of 170 who enrolled within that time frame represents a completion rate of approximately 24%. Since attrition of the first Goodrich class was somewhat higher than that of succeeding classes, there is reason to expect that this completion rate will increase in subsequent years, although no certainty of that exists at the present time.

As a kind of administrative "bottom-line," however, the figure bears careful scrutiny.

But any comprehensive judgments about student flow either in the Goodrich Program or in the University must await further analysis of more carefully collected data. Current statistical records do not permit the sort of sensitive analyses that are necessary if real knowledge of how students use the institution is to be gathered. The University now has the data-processing capacity to make such analyses, and should do so.

As shown in Table 1.8 two-thirds of the Goodrich graduates are women. Most receive their degrees either from Education (32%) or from CPACS (30%), and do not go on to graduate school; supporting the notion that Goodrich students are professionally-oriented and profession-bound. This is not surprising in light of the emphasis of the Goodrich Curriculum (see below) and probably represents what Feldman and Newcomb

have called the "accentuation" of general attitudes and orientations already held in embryonic form (1969, p. 335).

An examination of the list of occupations held by Goodrich graduates (Appendix C) shows that only a few are with organizations in the private sector, illustrating again the social-service orientation held by the students and fostered by their experiences in Goodrich.

The Goodrich Experience

Students are clearly impressed with their Goodrich experience, having been somewhat surprised to find it so open and rewarding. They give credit for this to the faculty primarily, who are seen as open, accepting, competent, and highly committed to student success. Other factors that stand out in their experience include the multi-cultural atmosphere that is formed and fostered, and the closeness that exists among students and with faculty, both in and out of class.

During interviews with students, several comments in response to a question about what stands out in the Goodrich experience illustrate the student reactions:

> "I liked the attention we get in class. It is more personal. Teachers learn your names."
>
> "The teachers seem to care about students and go out of their way to help students. The Program would not be half as good without it."
>
> "You learn more if you think the teachers are at the same level that you are and not way above."
>
> "I think that (what stands out is) the way the teachers showed a personal relationship with you."
>
> "Goodrich faculty are particularly interested in students. Other faculty are just interested in the courses that they teach."

> "The professors I've had--the interest they take in students. It's been a real encouragement to me and it's helped me a lot. To know that someone is behind you makes you work harder."

> "All the teachers know your name. You're not just a social security number."

This importance of the personal treatment students received is made even clearer by their comparisons of Goodrich instructors with those in other courses. Over and over the greater personal attention and closeness of the Goodrich instructors was pointed out and contrasted with the way non-Goodrich instructors tended to concentrate on their subject matter.

> "Goodrich instructors were more understanding with student problems than other faculty on campus. Other instructors seem so . . . not cold, but a feeling you get that they are big business guys."

> "Goodrich professors are particularly interested in you as a person. Other professors are interested only in the course that they teach. Any conference would be only about that grade in their course."

Even the negative comments of students about their experience reflected a reaction to faculty concern and involvement. Certain students (few in number) felt that the personal attention paid to Goodrich students was excessive and bordered on spoon-feeding. Such close personal attention and concern for the success of each student did not, in their view, adequately prepare Goodrich students for the university.

But such views are clearly in the minority; and the positive advantages of close personal interaction with professors were seen as definite highlights of the Goodrich Program. Given the number of research studies in higher education that have attested to the importance for student development of personal interaction with professors

(Feldman and Newcomb, 1969, and Chickering, 1968) a program which can supply such interaction as consistently as does the Goodrich Program is likely to contribute significantly to student growth.

In addition to comments from students, responses to the College Student Questionnaire of ETS also provide indications of the nature and value of the Goodrich experience. As shown in Table 1.9 students are generally satisfied with their studies, facilities, faculty, and their own academic standing. Table 1.10 shows the rank order of areas in which Goodrich students have found personal satisfaction. The fact that the most important area of personal satisfaction involves self-discovery and self-insight and that the next three most important areas deal with academic issues suggests that the students' high regard for faculty, for their help and openness, is oriented toward the academic success that is so important in the program.

Student estimates of the character and prestige of the Goodrich Program are shown in Table 1.11. Apparently students have a strong sense that Goodrich is made up of bright students who are generally competitive in an academic sense but who are also in a program that encourages individualism. There seems in the view of the students to be no great pressure on campus to change the program; but also that its prestige on campus is not very high.

Comparison of Goodrich and Non-Goodrich Students

It has already been shown that Goodrich students perform with reasonable adequacy in relation to University grading standards. The Ad Hoc Committee which reviewed and approved the Goodrich Program has attested in its final report to:

1. The equivalent and even greater demands placed on Goodrich students in their courses.

2. The comparability of Goodrich course outlines, grading procedures, and course evaluations which indicates equivalent standards.

3. The equivalence of Goodrich faculty.

The fact that Goodrich students represent such diverse cultural groups and that they interact so intensively would suggest that other differences would become apparent from students who have neither the financial need of Goodrich students, nor who experience their special support services. Responses to a set of questions assessing the alienation levels of Goodrich and non-Goodrich students are shown in Table 1.11. Of the twenty-four items on the questionnaire, Goodrich and non-Goodrich students differed significantly ($P \leq .05$) on seven. Those seven items showed that:

1. Non-Goodrich students feel more strongly that it is wishful thinking to believe one can really influence what happens in the University. (Item 2)

2. Non-Goodrich students feel less an integral part of the University Community. (Item 6)

3. Non-Goodrich students feel more that things have become so complicated within the University that they really do not understand just what is going on.

4. Non-Goodrich students feel more that they don't have as many friends as they would like at the University.

5. Non-Goodrich students feel more helpless in the face of what is happening within the University.

6. Non-Goodrich students feel more that the forces affecting them within the University are so complex and confusing that they find it difficult to make effective decisions.

7. Non-Goodrich students feel more that their experience at the University has been devoid of meaningful relationships.

A distinct picture emerges of Goodrich students as less alienated and with more of a sense of control and confidence. The stated aim of the Goodrich Program in its 1976 Self-Study to "enable (students) to have confidence in themselves and their ability to succeed" (p. 3), seems from this evidence to have been substantially met.

Impact of the Goodrich Program on Students

Academic success as the primary objective of the Goodrich Program is difficult to attribute directly to the faculty and courses because so many other factors must be taken into account. The most direct (and perhaps the most persuasive) indication of the impact of the program can be derived from student responses to the interview question which asked, "How has the Program changed you?"

Of those who described changes that had taken place, all but one saw those changes as positive and valuable. The one negative assessment had to do with a reaction against minority students, the development of decreased sympathy for their problems because of a perception that so much was made of them in the Goodrich Program.

But the overwhelming majority of those who felt changes had taken place saw them as positive and as falling generally into 3 categories:

1. Attainment of useful skills and attitudes for the University

   "made me study harder"

   "gave me confidence, encouragement to talk to people, to adjust to the University situation"

   "I became more outgoing and I also participate more in class"

   "The philosophy part of the Program, the critical reasoning, has helped me with some other classes"

"Not as afraid of essay tests now. I learned how to take one"

2. Development of more openness and awareness

"Goodrich has changed my life style. I have gotten a broader perspective on life in general"

"When you walk on the campus the kids look high class but when you see a Goodrich student you say "Hi" and start talking to him . . . it gives you a good feeling"

"I enjoy looking and talking to faces. When I walk around campus, I don't look at my feet. I look at people and respond."

3. Increased ethnic and cultural awareness (This was the most frequent change reported by students.)

"Before . . . it was a white world for me. I have learned so much about other races and cultures"

"Helped me feel more comfortable in other classes at UNO, even if I was the only black"

"A beautiful experience to share with people from other cultures and racial backgrounds . . . sometimes you find out you have common experiences"

"Gave me a brighter outlook on different cultures and not just the stereotype. I had earlier believed in stereotypes but now I know what they do and are like."

"I come from a long line of bigots. Since I started here I have gotten a whole different outlook on race relations . . . dropped some prejudices"

CHAPTER 2

GOODRICH FACULTY

An essential element in the original Goodrich plan was the close interaction of students with high-quality intellectually-oriented faculty. An initial conception of having older distinguished visiting scholars serve as organizer and major presenter in conjunction with younger tutor-professors does not seem to have functioned successfully and has been abandoned. The story of that changeover is briefly treated in the Goodrich Self-Study and is of only historical interest here. It is reasonably clear that a) the current faculty are much more pleased with the present arrangement in which they have greater responsibility, and b) it is unlikely that a return to the predominant use of visiting professors who design and control the instructional process is as adequately suited to the purposes of the Goodrich Program as is the current system.

The current faculty consists of seven FTE positions. Five faculty, one of whom serves as Director of the Program, have been with Goodrich since it began. These faculty are assisted by five graduate assistants, an administrative assistant, and a secretary as well as a certain amount of part-time help.

Faculty Workload

Estimates of faculty workload and different activities are

derived from an analysis of logs of faculty activities during a particular week. As shown in Table 2.1 the average amount of time spent on activities related to their Goodrich responsibilities by 5 primary teaching faculty who prepared logs (2 did not) is 35.2 hours/week.

To the extent that it is possible to generalize from these data to other time periods, it appears that the faculty activities are concentrated in teaching-related activities. Since all faculty members are also affiliated with another department at UNO it is likely that their overall workload is considerably higher and varies among individuals to the extent that the extra-Goodrich affiliation is seen as important.

Student Reactions to Faculty

The highly positive image that Goodrich students have of the Goodrich faculty has already been shown in the high proportion of faculty-related laudatory comments made spontaneously by students in describing their experiences and in comparing Goodrich and non-Goodrich professors. The Ad Hoc Committee report further documented the students' generally favorable view of faculty competence, breadth, and dedication (p. 11). Responses to items of the College Student Questionnaire, shown in Table 2.2 present a general picture of the quality of Goodrich faculty as perceived by some Goodrich students. The largest percentages relate to characteristics that are of priority in Goodrich, including knowing students by name (75.7%), encouraging student argument (75.3%) and meeting students privately about work (89.0%).

Goodrich Teaching Techniques

The secret of success for Goodrich faculty seems to be close involvement with students and careful attention to their work, their problems, and their progress. The fact that the program is relatively small and close-knit undoubtedly is a critical factor in their being able to provide such assistance.

It is clear, however, that statistical description of what the faculty do is highly abstracted, even simplistic; and real understanding of what makes Goodrich instruction work requires much closer analysis. In this analysis, the professor's role and style can be seen as diverse and highly individualistic, dependent upon the demands of given courses, the nature of the individual students to whom the teacher responds, and the personal style of the instructor. Such complexity makes it misleading to speak of instructional processes that characterize Goodrich. Rather must one describe a series of unique approaches and try to glean from them a sense of what makes Goodrich teaching work.

It is precisely for this reason, as one graduate assistant pointed out, that formal student evaluations using the University's accepted mode are inadequate both as feedback and as the basis for administrative judgments about teaching quality. For a teacher to become aware of those aspects of his or her teaching that do not work for students requires complex, sensitive, and even blunt assessments that standardized processes simply cannot convey. An important role that graduate assistants can and do play in Goodrich is the mediation of that feedback from student to instructor. The recognition seems to have occurred in Goodrich that this role for graduate students can be a

contributing factor to the quality of teaching; and is an idea that other faculty in other programs might also find useful.

Teaching techniques in Goodrich cover a wide range from presentation of material in lecture format, through cognitively-oriented discussions, affective and value-laden interactions and experiences, to intensive task-oriented tutoring in skills and techniques. Although each teacher gave a self-description that emphasized one or another of those approaches, it became clear in discussion and in observing teachers in action that most are comfortable with more than one mode and are able to adapt it to the needs of both students and subject matter.

Some examples of the teaching process at work in Goodrich may clarify by illustrating the range and diversity of its approaches:

First year students in Humanities take part in a simulation called "Star-Power" in which they negotiate with each other in competitive and cooperative ways to gain advantages. In one session their learning is experiential as they encounter the feelings of being powerful and powerless, of manipulating and being manipulated. In a subsequent follow-up session they are encouraged to apply what they have learned to an understanding of the theories of social class and power relationships. The multi-racial and multi-ethnic character of the large group is obvious to this observer, but unusual in that the interactions are more comfortable and open across cultural and racial lines and have more the flavor or individuals confronting each other as such rather than as representatives of a social group.

First year students in Critical Reasoning study an argument about the pros and cons of abortion. They are encouraged to look for the

distinguishing premises underlying opposing viewpoints; and form conclusions by examining linguistic clues and reconstructing arguments according to logical formulae. The natural tendency of the uncritical thinker initially to take a stand on the basis of personal values is called to students' attention; and they are encouraged to hold back that tendency and to examine arguments. Thus a powerful logical tool is made available that can serve a student throughout college. (The University has already attested indirectly to the value of this approach by offering Critical Reasoning as a Philosophy course outside of the Goodrich Program.)

Students in second-year Social Sciences hear a lecture on the application of psychological theory to the study of urban problems. Examples are given of the analysis of a society which preaches against violence and yet portrays it as glamorous on television. Students are shown the contradictions in society, contradictions that lead to class inequities and oppression. The aim is to raise consciousness about the underlying subleties of social forces while at the same time providing students with theoretical information with which to deal conceptually with those forces.

Students facing an essay examination are invited to a professor's home for a rap session intended to prepare them. This approach generates an issue among faculty by raising the possibility (already alluded to earlier) that there may be a danger of "spoon-feeding" Goodrich students; of implying by the extra effort that Goodrich students cannot "make it" on their own. The issue is not a major problem in Goodrich but highlights the potential conflict between traditional academic views which emphasize student responsibility; and the

remedial emphasis which seems necessary to overcome educational inequality.

Faculty in the Social Sciences prepare and present modules on different topics that reflect their own academic specialties. Students are encouraged to discuss the material presented; but more often they play the passive role of recipients.

Faculty in the Humanities have developed a team-teaching approach in which all three faculty assigned to a course take time presenting to and leading discussions of small groups. There seems to be strong sentiment among some of the faculty for this approach which has the advantages of 1) encouraging faculty to prepare more thoroughly; and 2) permitting students to see faculty disputing and discussing with one another in an intensive but collegial manner.

Its disadvantages seem to be the amount of time that must be spent in coordinating the preparation of materials and in deciding on the relative importance of different topics; and in its inhibition of individual faculty desire to develop specialities. Where it works well, its advantages for students can be enormous.

Students in the Social Science sequence take part in an action research project in which they learn by actual practice the techniques of designing an interview schedule, choosing a sample, carrying out interviews, and tabulating the results. The topic chosen for the research study is one dealing with people in occupations similar to ones they will later be filling so that their learning can be more appropriate and relevant.

The diversity of methods in the Goodrich Program is outstanding and the faculty not only seem to handle the different methods competently but are constantly assessing their own skills and seeking approaches that are more effective with students. Some very high quality college teaching is taking place in this Program and the commitment to continual improvement seems likely to continue.

Attitudes Toward Teaching

The characteristics that Goodrich faculty feel are critical for becoming and being effective with students can be divided into four general categories:

1. Command of techniques
2. Personal qualities
3. Interpersonal capabilities
4. Experiences

1. Command of techniques. Goodrich faculty agree on the necessity of teaching certain remedial skills to students whose economic situation has in many cases been accompanied by inadequate high school preparation. But there is also inherent in the Goodrich ideal the attainment of academic excellence in a highly cognitive set of subjects. Faculty thus must be able not only to handle both elementary skill training and high-level conceptualization, but must be able to shift easily back and forth across the two realms. Some faculty of course are more comfortable in one or the other, and the team-teaching concept makes possible the emphasizing of different special skills; but there is among Goodrich faculty a clear recognition of the importance of both.

Thus it is not at all surprising to find faculty agreeing that academic competence in one's own field must be sought; but that the teaching of basic skills is to be highly valued as well. It is likely that highly significant research could be carried out by Goodrich faculty on questions of a proper mix of such skills and techniques.

2. Personal qualities. Since Goodrich faculty are highly individualistic, and approach their responsibilities in very diverse ways, one might expect that they would point to equally diverse personal characteristics as important. But here too there is substantial commonality, and agreement on the personal qualities that a Goodrich teacher must have to be successful.

Of greatest importance is a sense of responsibility for the success of students, a sense that goes beyond the usual preparation of one's class and prompt handing in of grades. When a Goodrich student does poorly, faculty go out of their way to find out what is wrong. This sometimes extends to pressing students beyond their own expectation and tolerance. One professor described an instance in which, while checking a particular student's absence, he was told by the student, "Hey, you're not my mother, I have to work." The professor's reaction was to feel that it is better to press too hard and have to back off than to adopt the traditional view that his responsibility extends no further than presenting the material and leaving the rest up to the student.

The strong sense that a Goodrich faculty member's responsibility extends beyond the traditional is also manifested by the common practice of inviting students home, and of being willing to work evenings and weekends. The small size and intense interactions of the Program

make such an attitude both possible and necessary.

Other personal qualities that were deemed important to Goodrich faculty included the flexibility necessary to accept criticism--often blunt criticism--from students and from other faculty, both qualities believed necessary for building effective curricular and instructional teamwork. Willingness to learn from each other and constantly to seek better approaches is an unusually effective form of faculty development. Its effectiveness is limited only by the lack of time necessary to establish an appropriate and constructive atmosphere for such communication. Each year the Goodrich faculty and staff get away together to work out these communication issues among themselves in a relaxed atmosphere extending over 2 to 3 days. The value of such periodic reviews and interaction should not be underestimated and resources for them should be seen as a priority.

Attitudes that are seen as critical for success include finally a deep commitment to undergraduate education and to the validity of using education to effect social change.

3. Interpersonal qualities. In view of the student assessments of their experience which emphasized the importance of their interaction with faculty, it would be strange to find that such interpersonal concerns were not also of significance to faculty. Indeed, some of the most graphic descriptions of what make faculty effective and ineffective pertained to such interpersonal characteristics.

Empathy, warmth, relaxedness, and a sense of humor were seen to be necessary qualities by Goodrich instructors. The diversity of Goodrich students, the fact that they have not been totally socialized into "appropriate" reaction to professors, the kinds of classroom

interactions that are fostered in Goodrich, all require that a faculty member "stay loose" and treat each student as a unique and authentic individual.

This openness must, however, be integrated with an accurate sense of the difference in role between Goodrich student and teacher. The fine line between an informality that breeds respect and an informality that breeds contempt is a line that must be established; and it appears to be the teacher's task to establish and maintain it. Interactions can and should be intensive and personal, but always oriented to the student's development and attainment of Goodrich goals.

Students may have less difficulty understanding this difference in role than faculty. Their responses indicate surprise and pleasure that faculty can be personal and easy to talk to, but they seem instinctively to know how far they can test the relationship, and are not unhappy when faculty establish limits--limits of understanding how far personal problems can interfere with studies, and limits of how far afield discussions can go.

Professors who wish to maximize their effectiveness need to learn, as one Goodrich professor put it, to "make themselves dispensable," to instill in students a confidence and capability to learn on their own that will keep them from becoming or remaining too dependent.

Generally there seems to be awareness among Goodrich faculty of the necessity of finding and maintaining this fine line. Concern expressed by certain faculty about the danger of becoming too close seemed more to be an early warning designed to "prevent" such problems, and not an indication that such a problem exists to a major extent.

4. Experience with minority and disadvantaged students. For faculty, the service to diverse minorities requires a willingness to work with them and a sensitivity to their different cultural backgrounds and to its likely effect on them as students. This awareness must be kept in balance by a respect for differences in cultures that is not paternalistic. As one professor put it, the teacher must have a healthy awareness of ethnic differences and sympathy for their disadvantages but without a tendency to excuse poor performance with the unstated but implied view that "they can't help it".

Goodrich Anti-Model

The qualities that are seen as desirable in a Goodrich teacher can be highlighted by describing the characteristics of teachers who would not succeed in the Goodrich Program. Goodrich faculty described the following negative stereotypes:

1. an authoritarian personality whose rigidity does not permit flexible reactions to student diversity.
2. a hard-nosed academician who cares more for subject-matter than for students.
3. a "colonizer" who has the truth and is content to impose it on the one or two students he/she is able to get through to.
4. the wishy-washy type who provides no direction at all for students.

The characteristics of rigidity, insensitivity, and lack of appreciation for the human beings for whom he is responsible, are all characteristics of bad teachers, regardless of the setting in which they teach. Traditional students, especially those who have had reasonable academic success, have learned over their years of schooling how to cope with such teachers. But the students of Goodrich

have had fewer such experiences coupled with success; and are more vulnerable. Hence the need for fostering the desirable qualities and eschewing the undesirable is, in Goodrich, more critical than it might be elsewhere. The selection and promotion of faculty whose primary role is teaching in Goodrich should take adequate account of such need.

CHAPTER 3

THE CURRICULUM

The array of courses and experiences which Goodrich students encounter differs markedly from that of the typical UNO student for the first two years; but is designed to achieve an equivalent result. This result has two parts:

1. To provide a broad general education.
2. To prepare the student for successfully pursuing a major field of study.

Approximately one-third of regular undergraduate course work at UNO is occupied with general education and distribution courses which provide a liberal arts base for various degree programs. According to the University's Self-Study (1976), this base typically involves

a) two semesters of English,

b) extensive study in the division of humanities, natural science and social science, and

c) one course in mathematics.

Recognizing the importance of this basis for successful completion of the baccalaureate, the Goodrich Program has concentrated its efforts on general education. In its initial plan, all elements of general education were to have been addressed; but in practice, the emphasis has been on the Humanities and Social Science. To supplement the coursework, Goodrich has also added a specially organized Study Skills Center to provide intensive academic skill-training and

assistance to students. So integral to the Goodrich Program is this service that it can truly be said to be an essential part of the Goodrich curriculum.

The Goodrich Curricular Philosophy

As stated in the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate the Goodrich Program:

> The General education courses are designed to introduce students to a comprehensive exploration of the problems and issues of contemporary American Society and to develop in students the requisite skills for undertaking an independent, rigorous, critical analysis of those problems and issues (p. 13).

Each element of the first two years of the Goodrich Program is directed in one way or another to the fulfillment of those goals. This fact was attested to by the Ad Hoc Committee in its recommendation that both the Goodrich Humanities sequence and the Goodrich Social Science sequence be accepted in part toward fulfilling the general education requirements for a degree in the College of Arts and Science. Currently, all Goodrich courses can contribute to the fulfillment of requirements, in the following manner:

English 111 (3 credits of Humanities)
Philosophy 121 Critical Reasoning (3 credits of Humanities)
Humanities 111 (6 credits of Humanities)
Social Science 211 and 212 (6 credits of Social Science and 6 credits of elective)

There remained at this writing some reluctance on the part of the School of Education in recognizing the Goodrich courses as part of the required general education sequence for the Education degree. It is not entirely clear why recognition is being withheld given the College of Arts and Sciences decision. Inquiries into the matter are continuing.

Though the Program provides a written rationale for each Goodrich course, a further inquiry was made of individual faculty to determine the purpose of each part of the curriculum. This inquiry served to clarify the relationships among Goodrich Program goals, Goodrich curricular objectives, and the teaching approaches of different faculty members.

Semester I--English. Goodrich students, unless they score sufficiently high on a proficiency test, are required to take English composition. The focus of this course as taught in Goodrich is the development of basic writing skills sufficient to write a standard theme with an acceptable minimum of errors. Students who enter the Goodrich Program with this ability already (some 20% of the incoming students each year) are passed on to more advanced English courses. This approach embodies the major elements of a competence-based program, and allows for student heterogeneity while endorsing a minimum standard of performance.

English 111 is based on five modules of instruction called "Writing Skills," "Summary," "Paragraph," "Essay-Test," and "Theme." In English 111 students hopefully master basic mechanics (spelling, sentence structure, punctuation) and organization and gain confidence in their writing abilities. The English instructor has found it useful when working with Goodrich students to acquaint them with sentence structure through sentence combining exercises. She also spends time on principles of organization and has students practice recognizing levels of generalization and specifics. The English and Critical Reasoning courses, it is hoped, have a favorable impact on students' reading speed and comprehension.

Problems students have include weakness in separating the general from the specific in writing and in understanding sentence structure. This latter capacity is crucial to knowing whether or not common sentence punctuation is accurate. Since reading speed and comprehension are both seen as necessary to achieving these capacities, the development of reading skills (a function of the Study Skills Center) is seen as critical.

The primary English instructor in Goodrich cited student performance in advanced English courses, and student improvement over the course of the semester in writing standarized paragraphs to support her judgment that Goodrich students who have writing problems can and do learn to write adequate English.

Semester I--Critical Reasoning. The purpose of Philosophy 121 or Critical Reasoning is twofold. First, students are taught to understand arguments by learning to distinguish premise from conclusion; and by learning to "read between the lines," for linguistic clues and holes in arguments. Such skill generates comfort with and ability to handle abstract ideas. Second, students learn to distinguish among types of theories, to determine which are conceptual and which are empirical; and thereby to know how inferences drawn from them should be viewed. The end competence sought is that of skill in analyzing arguments; and evidence of attainment of the competence is derived from observation of students restructuring arguments according to a standard form and observing students' ability to respond in class discussions, not by agreeing or disagreeing with a value position, but by examining the arguments upon which the position is based.

The Critical Reasoning course has been organized so that students

can receive a considerable amount of individual attention. Rather than the entire group of approximately sixty students meeting in one classroom for three hours per week, classroom contact for much of the semester has been arranged in the following way. Two days each week, students are divided into groups of approximately 30 and meet in separate classrooms for the presentation of materials. On the third day students meet in groups of approximately five with an instructor or student assistant to work more individually on assigned exercises. In addition, twenty hours per week are scheduled as times during which students may get extra help from an instructor or student assistant. Further individual instruction is provided by supplemental individual meetings attendent to the two paper projects offered during the semester.

Since Goodrich faculty teach the Critical Reasoning class to non-Goodrich students as well, some comparisons of performance and progress are possible. Goodrich students start out with less competence in critical reasoning, according to their instructor, but by the time the class has ended, they have caught up. As mentioned above, comparison of scores on a test of critical reasoning given to both Goodrich and non-Goodrich students (Table 1.5) showed no significant differences in performance.

The instructors are currently working on a textbook for the course which will overcome what they believe to be a major problem of traditional approaches--too heavy a reliance on mathematical approaches to logic which cause students to lose interest. The Philosophy Department has already shown its acceptance of the course by having it offered to non-Goodrich students. The new instructional

materials should make the course more valuable still, both to Goodrich and non-Goodrich students.

Semester II--Humanities. The purpose of the Goodrich Humanities sequence, called "Perspectives on American culture," is to elucidate the phenomenon of alienation by showing its literary and artistic manifestations in American society. Emphasis on alienation grew out of early faculty realization that the classical aspects of typical approaches to the humanities (the culture of ancient Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, etc.) were not familiar enough to students to be seen as relevant. The four units of the course, an introduction to alienation, a section on science and society, a section on art, and a special project introduce students to the humanities in a manner derived from and related to their own life.

Thus, for instance, the course includes showing and analyzing contemporary American films, such as Midnight Cowboy and The Last Picture Show which powerfully illustrate alienation in American society. This is followed by analysis of the alienating effects of rapid technological developments in American society, then by the ways in which art manifests that alienation. Careful attention is paid to introducing students to methods whereby art works and cultural artifacts can be analyzed for their meaning, for the purpose heightening the students' critical sense and enriching their mental life. Students become competent through this course in applying rationality to cultural and artistic products and thereby defusing their seriousness and vagueness. Evidence of students having attained that competence can be inferred from their enhanced ability to create and explain abstract representations. In one instance, a faculty member reported

being impressed by the number of students who in an assignment involving the use of construction paper to coordinate shape, color, and texture, were able to both generate and explain at high levels of abstraction, the function and meaning of the forms.

Other instances of student analysis of books and one instance observed by this writer of students discussing social power relationships illustrate the success of this approach.

Although it seems natural that what students learn in the English and Critical Reasoning courses of Semester 1 can be used to deepen and enhance the learnings in the humanities course, it was not immediately apparent to faculty that such carry-over took place. More coordination of materials between the two semesters and concerted effort by faculty to encourage students to use the competences of the earlier courses, and to take notice when they do so, should enhance the already marked success of this sequence.

Second Year--Semester I. Social Sciences 211-212 is a two-semester twelve hour sequence that, in the words of the Ad Hoc Committee Report:

> attempts to synthesize the knowledge and perspectives of various social sciences with the hope of providing students a better understanding of how public policy decisions are made in our society, what their consequences are, and what options for change exist for them and their society (p. 15).

The first semester is oriented to research methodology and seeks to introduce students to the tools and techniques of social science and the way they are applied to the analysis of social policy. Students carry out research projects which involve them in the investigative techniques used by social scientists. The diverse approaches of the instructors in this sequence seem to insure that students gain

experience in using analytic and conceptual frameworks (which are important in defining and limiting a research problem as well as in deciding upon an investigative approach); the "nitty-gritty" data gathering methods such as sampling, designing and administering an interview schedule, and tabulating the results; and in organizing and interpreting data derived from real-life situations with their enormous number of variables and complex interrelationships. While it is clear that one course cannot develop competence in the use of these methods, students do gain an awareness and appreciation of them.

The second semester of social science is devoted to a modular presentation of several social science topics in which the Goodrich faculty, supplemented by others as guests, present material based upon their own faculty expertise. Modules in the psychology of urban problems, economics, education, the political/legal system, and others seem ideally suited to the diversity of faculty expertise and to the complexity of the material that needs to be covered.

Assessment

The Goodrich curriculum is an integral part of the program, and reflects in its diversity and innovativeness a healthy educational spirit that the rest of the University is beginning more and more to recognize. The Ad Hoc Commttee judged that its standards are comparable, and its evaluation procedures identical to those of existing Arts and Science courses, a fact which led them to recommend the acceptability of the courses as fulfilling general education requirements. Beyond that, the Committee commented that:

> Goodrich Program courses, in some areas, appear more demanding than courses these students might have chosen to fulfill requirements for a degree in College of Arts and Sciences. Examinations clearly show students are held responsible for the ideas presented by the many outside resource people brought in to supplement the courses. Small classes demand performance on a more continuous basis than large classes, where only a few, if any, can participate in a discussion. It is difficult to hide unpreparedness in a small class where students must become involved. Students in the Goodrich Program appear to be exposed to a larger variety of teaching techniques than is possible in the usual course offerings at this level. The personal contact with faculty is one of those intangible benefits Goodrich faculty feel students have in their program and would find difficult to achieve in other course offerings for freshmen and sophomores.

Most student reaction to the curriculum commented on faculty informality and closeness, as described above. A few students, however, made positive comments about the courses themselves that illustrate their relevance:

> "The social science classes related to my life."
>
> "Course material well-chosen."
>
> "more challenging--gave me a good background for doing papers"
>
> "courses are essential to daily life"
>
> "Humanities is pretty relevant. I have learned a lot this semester, more than I have in all my other years in school"
>
> "Goodrich courses are hard, but structured in such a way you can learn them because of the extra tutoring."
>
> "Goodrich courses are so much more open. The speakers have impressed me. Subject matter is so much more interesting."

Other students reacted less positively:

> "Goodrich courses were interesting, but could have been harder. They are geared like to high school. The class would hold back if four or five kids didn't get it."
>
> "Not much difference in the courses."
>
> "took a long time to go over an idea. I got bored and started blocking things out."

"Goodrich courses are relatively easy. I did not like all the discussion going on all the time."

"Goodrich courses in a way are not very important. A lot of trivial things that common sense would tell you."

"The course brought about racial separation. Presentation of material was too dramatic."

The last quote echoes a concern brought up initially by faculty which, upon further probing, seemed to uncover a matter of concern to all, one that had surfaced in past semesters, and was currently under discussion.

In the social science sequence, students are engaged in discussion about topics of social concern that are intimately connected with racism. The emphasis is not due to happenstance but rather to design, for the following reasons:

1. Racism is one of the most critical American social problems, one which subtly and unsubtly pervades public policy. Thus it is appropriate that a policy-oriented sequence should deal heavily with it.

2. The large proportion of black students in Goodrich find it interesting and useful to discuss problems relevant to their own lives; and the equally large proportion of white students mostly from lower socio-economic strata are also deeply affected by racial problems and structures.

But a problem seems to have been generated for certain students by the rather sudden shift from a first year sequence taught entirely by whites, to a second-year sequence taught predominantly by blacks. During their second year, white students who had been discussing predominantly white cultural problems, e.g. alienation, with white faculty found themselves having their first exposure to black faculty in a situation where a black student majority talked about prejudice with primarily black faculty. This led some white students to become defensive during presentations on racism.

The purpose of the course was to make students more critically aware of the global nature of prejudice; but an unintended consequence has been that some whites complained about too much emphasis on prejudice toward blacks, while blacks sat back and accepted uncritically what was being presented.

It must be understood how extraordinarily difficult it is in our society to come to grips with racial prejudice; and that the Goodrich Program has undertaken an enormous task in trying to generate a critical consciousness in students of social problems through the medium of highly academic curricular practices. The task of steering between a Scylla of indoctrination and a Charybdis of bland platitude is ever present. Those responsible for the Goodrich curriculum are to be commended both for taking on such a task and for being aware of the weaknesses in current approaches to it.

In order to adjust the course content and approach to overcome defensiveness while at the same time not retreating from the objective of generating a high-level critical consciousness, Goodrich is including in its analyses other examples of societal prejudice such as that toward Chicanos, Native Americans, and Asian Americans. In addition, attention is being paid to finding qualified representatives of minority groups to fill open faculty positions--minorities other than Afro-Americans for the social science sequence; and minorities including Afro-Americans for the Humanities sequence.

Goodrich Academic Study Skills Center

In keeping with its mission not only to provide access to low-income and minority students, but also to increase the likelihood that those students will be successful, an essential element of the Goodrich

curriculum is its program of special academic support, the primary component of which is the Study Skills Center.

One full-time coordinator and several graduate and undergraduate students, assisted by volunteer faculty members, meet with students singly and in groups to help them develop reading and study skills such as taking notes during lectures, using textbooks, and taking exams.

The Study Skills Center began in 1973 in response to a faculty sense that student course problems were related to deficiencies in the basic writing, reading, and study skills necessary for college success. Since its inception, almost 3000 student appointments have been held, including many with non-Goodrich students.

The idea for a Study Skills Center began with faculty frustration at the inability of Goodrich students to handle high-level conceptual course work, particularly in the Humanities courses. In order to help faculty understand that such poor performance was not due to basic inability, but rather to student need of special help, one member of the Goodrich staff began testing students for their reading ability and using those tests diagnostically to discover student skill needs and to provide remedial help.

Study Skills Center Technique. Current University practice is that any student scoring below the 33rd percentile on the Nelson-Denny Reading test is required to take a reading improvement course. Prior to this, students who had not voluntarily enrolled in the reading improvement course and who were identified by Goodrich staff as needing extra help with reading were encouraged to work on comprehension and vocabulary individually or in small groups with the staff.

Currently, students are offered the opportunity for counseling about reading problems and help with skill improvement. Generally, the students who are having difficulty understanding a particular textbook ask for this help. This assistance is given in an integrated and balanced way related directly to the student's course work. Thus, the skill improvement methods are not simply separate exercises but are geared to the textbooks appropriate to specific courses. However, reading exercises are available for those students who wish to improve their general reading ability but who are not having any difficulty reading a specific textbook.

Some attention is given to providing counseling or referral for students whose emotional problems are causing difficulty with study; but for the most part attention is task-oriented, concentrating on developing skills directly and allowing confidence to build as a consequence. The success of the approach is attested by a graduate student serving in the Center who had previously tutored in the English Department. He described Goodrich students as more prepared and more highly motivated when seeking help in writing a paper. Students in non-Goodrich English had often come to him with no prior work, and asked or implied that he should write the paper for them. Goodrich students by contrast came with an outline and seemed more willing to work. This perserverance was, in his view, a key to success. In helping students, the first task, he pointed out, was to discover how elementary the student's problem was. Often such problems could be traced back to a simple inability to recognize and distinguish nouns, verbs, and adjectives. When such probing became frustrating, great care and sensitivity was necessary in order to avoid

shattering a student's confidence.

The personal attention that the Study Skills Center provides is therefore one of its essential features; and the small, coherent size of the Goodrich Program is critical to maintaining that personal attention.

A clearer picture of the inner workings of the Study Skills Center, its strengths and weaknesses, successes and failures can be illustrated in anecdotal case studies of certain students who have made use of the center. The cases described here were selected in such a way as to represent three different ways students can respond to the services offered. It should be noted that these are not necessarily typical or representative students; but illustrate different levels of Center use and success. In addition it should be noted that the names used are fictitious.

Illustrative Case I--Jim C. is in academic difficulty. Ranked 177th out of 443 in his high school class, he has had trouble with all of his courses except ROTC and freshman geometry. Review of his writing sample showed that he tended to leave endings off nouns and verbs. This, in addition to several run-on sentences, led him to be judged a fairly high risk as a writer and to be recommended for the Summer Study Skills Workshop. Jim attended the 5-week session where, along with other students he studied the following subjects:

First Week - paragraph main ideas, reading, spelling and vocabulary

Second Week - classifications, general and specific, the making of a formal outline

Third Week - techniques of reading textbooks; taking notes, underlining, and margin notes; general college information including how to calculate grade-point averages

Fourth Week - techniques of taking notes from a tape recording and from a live lecturer. Throughout the weeks, work continued on reading, spelling, and vocabulary

Fifth Week - techniques for taking objective and essay tests with emphasis on reducing test anxiety. A practice essay exam was given on the live lecture of the previous week.

Jim improved markedly during the summer, raising his score, for instance, from 40% (pre-test) to 80% (post-test) in taking lecture notes. Though quiet and shy at the beginning of the session, he was observed to assert himself more and more in discussion about assigned readings and to refer to what he had read to back up his arguments.

In fall he took an English course in Goodrich. With his reading test scores and high school record, he would have had to take a special reading course before taking English had he not been in Goodrich, but instead he took Reading Improvement concurrently with English.* During the semester he worked very closely with an English tutor (a Goodrich graduate assistant) but did not show very much improvement. He continued to have trouble with spelling, punctuation, paragraph form, and tense. Beyond his appointments with the English tutor, Jim came to the lab for extra help only a few times; and did not do well in his courses, ending up the semester on probation.

The following semester he did very little better, and when counseled about an incipient F in Humanities, revealed severe problems at

---

*A supplemental reading program was set up for Jim in the Lab, but he did not follow through on his appointments.

home to which he was not responding well. Further discussion revealed very poor study habits "about an hour each week," and more psychological problems which the staff of the Center were not equipped to handle.

According to the staff of the Study Skills Center, Jim was not well-served by the Center because the key to his difficulties was not found. He continues to write poorly and may have difficulty finishing the program.

It appears to an external observer, however, that the Goodrich staff and faculty have made extraordinary efforts to help, well beyond what he would have received outside of Goodrich. Each of his problems was met with a specific remedial plan as soon as it was uncovered. If he does not succeed, it will not be due to lack of adequate and appropriate support.

Illustrative Case II--Ruth J. is older, about mid-30's, and stopped her first phase of formal education at grade 8. After completing high school by means of the GED test, scoring below the 25th percentile in all subjects except mathematics (27th percentile), she applied for and was accepted in the Goodrich Program. She was responsible at that time for a rather large family, and was herself from an even larger one. She attended the Goodrich summer session and showed herself to need a great deal of help with reading and vocabulary. During her first regular term she received an incomplete for English but did better in other courses, including reading improvement and critical reasoning. During the second semester she received higher grades, the only remaining problem being English from which she withdrew.

In her work at the Study Skills Center she concentrated on improving her skills in mathematics. She organized small study groups because she found working alone more difficult, and was very proud to receive a passing grade in mathematics. At the Study Skills Center she received help mostly for understanding the concepts, ideas, and vocabulary required for her courses. From her entrance into Goodrich she had difficulty understanding the main ideas and the concepts in her assigned work; but is an enormously motivated woman who is very curious.

Despite many academic difficulties, she appears to be maintaining a respectable grade point average; and to be gradually overcoming her weaknesses in reading and writing. According to observers, she "practically lived in the lab" using it to get the support and encouragement she needed to eradicate initial handicaps.

Illustrative Case III--Mike R. is an articulate, outspoken, and very highly motivated student who worked intensively in the summer program, asking a lot of questions and taking copious notes. He did not begin with severe difficulties, but made the usual complement of spelling and sentence structure errors. But his aspiration level was higher than most and he sought to use the lab to achieve perfect papers. His instructor remembers him as having proof-read his assignments so well by the time they were turned in that almost all mistakes were gone from them. He himself credits the lab with his having become a B student.

His writing difficulties are not of the mechanical variety but he has continued to work in the lab on their improvement.

During his second semester he became more independent, taking a

non-Goodrich English course and bringing material to the lab occasionally to chat about its organization. Once in a while he would ask for his work to be proofread but gradually he became more and more independent, which those responsible for the lab welcomed.

This is a student for whom the benefits of the Study Skills Center are perhaps most apparent, a student who is highly motivated and quite capable, but simply needs minor skill work and confidence building. He was aware of available help and quite willing to use it. Consequently he benefitted, is doing well academically, and should graduate without difficulty.

Student Reaction to the Center. Students being interviewed were asked about their use of the lab and their reactions to it. Some of their comments illustrate its helpfulness.

"It came in very handy."

"You can't go anywhere else to get help."

"One of the best things is the writing lab."

"I had a paper due and couldn't keep my appointment, so the professor gave me an extension until I could get into the lab. He even asked if he could help me."

"wonderful part of the program"

Not all students use the lab, some find that they don't need it, others that its conditions are not conducive to studying for them. One commented, for instance, that it was sometimes overcrowded making it difficult to talk with a tutor and to lay open all mistakes to the other students.

Assessment

There is no question, based upon analysis of case materials,

student and faculty reactions, and upon direct observation of its functions, that the Academic Study Skills Center is one of the Goodrich Program's most important elements. It serves as a combination lounge, study hall, and office for students, a place where they can work; converse with fellow-students and with instructors; and where they can easily grab a scissors or a ruler if that is necessary. Such a small event as being able to find a scissors close at hand may appear inconsequential, but the absence of such implements when immediately needed (an absence that is characteristic of libraries) can disrupt a student's study pattern and momentum. In students for whom conceptual analysis and hard concentrated study is a new experience, such disruptions take on a disproportionate and dysfunctional importance.

Needs

The Study Skills Center appears generally successful in providing support and assistance to Goodrich students; but could, in the view of its staff, benefit from the addition of certain resources.

1. Its library of instructional material currently consists mostly of general skill-building materials. Most of these are oriented toward the development of specific writing, reading, and study skills. To these materials should be added some works which are calculated to generate interest in subjects with which students might not be familiar, or which earlier experience might have rendered distasteful. A good example of such a work might be the book Mathematics for the Million, by Lancelot Hogben. This book seeks to generate interest in mathematics rather than merely teaching different mathematics technique. Such a book, and analogous material for the natural sciences, social

sciences, and the humanities, could contribute to student motivation as well as skill. The faculty could certainly suggest works from a number of different fields which would be appropriate.

2. Some attention should be given to the installation of several interactive computer terminals in the Goodrich Study Skills Center. Such terminals tied to the UNO computer and, if possible to the UN Lincoln computer could be used for both computer-assisted instruction (material presented systematically for learning), and computer aided instruction (computer programming of solutions to problems). Students could, as part of their opening social science course, learn how to use the computer to process and analyze research data, and automated systems for career-counseling could be used to help students become more vocationally sophisticated.*

3. The idea of full-time staff supplemented by faculty involvement is an appropriate one which will keep the Study Skills Center from becoming an isolated unit. Provision of services to more and more students can be achieved by using Goodrich undergraduate students as tutors and group leaders. Such teaching opportunities can be highly beneficial learning experiences for students, both those who give and those who receive them.

Curricular Impact on Students' Attitudes

A highly tentative and exploratory suggestion can be derived from data collected on the CSQ regarding the effect of the Goodrich curriculum on student attitudes and values. Table 3.1 presents student

---

*Recent reports indicate that such computer facilities are now being made available to Goodrich.

descriptions of their own philosophy as well as of their expectations about advanced study in the future. The Vocational emphasis is strong among Freshman and even stronger among Sophomores while other emphases are either the same or less important at the different levels. At the same time a 12.5% difference can be seen between Freshman and Sophomore expectations of continuing study. A possible interpretation of these data is that student desire to use college as a stepping stone to a vocation increases, but so also does awareness of the need to continue one's education. If the Goodrich program has been successful in inculcating into students both confidence and awareness of social reality, these trends are the ones likely to appear.

Similarly, selected attitudinal items comparing Goodrich Freshman and Sophomores suggest changes that might be curriculum-derived. Table 3.2 presents comparisons of Goodrich Freshman and Sophomores on social attitude. Those directly related to subjects dealt with in the Humanities and Social Science courses can be compared to see if changes took place in the direction sought by the courses. Such an analysis is, of course, very tentative and requires an assumption that change can be inferred from cross-sectional analysis. But Feldman and Newcomb (1969) have suggested that the results of cross-sectional analyses usually are highly consonant with those of longitudinal studies, and hence such an assumption can be held to have reasonable validity. Certain differences are in the expected directions:

1. Fewer sophomores than freshman would become indignant that a high government official has taken money in exchange for gifts or favors. This might suggest that Goodrich students are gaining an awareness of the complexities of social and political activity, and are less easily shocked.

2. More sophomores feel that labor unions are doing more good than harm, again suggesting greater social awareness.

3. More sophomores than freshman derive pleasure from listening to good live performances of classical music, a finding that may suggest some impact of the humanities sequence.

Clearly any such inferences as these are highly speculative and open to alternative judgment; but they do provide the beginning of more intensive analysis of how a college experience can have impact. Such analyses of attitude differences can become the basis of faithful discussion within the Goodrich Program regarding the effects of curriculum.

CHAPTER 4

THE ORGANIZATION

The Goodrich enabling legislation makes no mention of a specific program with a separate institutional identity, but merely specifies the waiving of tuition to low-income students; and leaves to the University the task of deciding on the nature and extent of support services, as well as the organizational structure through which they are to be provided.

Careful analysis of that structure reveals it to be complex and multi-dimensional, with ambiguous and even conflicting relationships to other university constituencies to which it is related. If the program being provided students is to attain its potential, its place in the organizational structure needs to be examined and clarified.

Officially, Goodrich is designated as a "Program" which makes it a separate administrative unit with somewhat less than departmental status.

The Goodrich Context

Its initial current administrative home, the College of Public Affairs and Community Service (CPACS) was a natural choice for a number of reasons, chief among them being that the Program's designer, Dr. Hubert G. Locke, was at the time Dean of CPACS. In addition, the orientation of CPACS was at that time more dominated by its community

service emphasis. This meant that the application of the resources of the university to the solution of community problems was a high priority. The Goodrich Program with its emphasis on providing effective access and opportunity to low-income students was naturally well-placed in CPACS.

The benefits to Goodrich of being administratively placed in CPACS are, according to observers, substantial. First, Goodrich is innovative and needs to remain flexible. This would prove difficult in more traditional and more established colleges than CPACS where departments have less flexibility. CPACS itself is innovative and provides a more congenial atmosphere for Goodrich. Second, CPACS is a young and growing college dealing with fields that are generally able to attract funds whereas colleges such as Arts and Sciences have greater financial difficulties. The temptation to use Goodrich funds to support tenured faculty would be stronger in colleges other than CPACS. Finally, the faculty and staff of CPACS reportedly tend to be more sensitive than those in other colleges to opening university facilities and opportunities to ethnic minorities and other previously excluded groups.

Developments in recent years however, have begun to change earlier patterns; and it is necessary for the current faculty and staff of both Goodrich and CPACS to re-examine their relationship and take account of new demands and new realities. CPACS seems to have shifted its emphasis to give at least as high a priority to public affairs as to community service. The difference between these two emphases is subtle but important. Community Service works more directly with the public and hence is more oriented to social problems and social change.

it is activist and even a little radical. Public Affairs on the other hand sees the solution of social problems as occurring more appropriately through duly elected or appointed officials. Its interest is more bureaucratic, stability-oriented, and conservative. The atmosphere in which the Goodrich Program now functions may be less supportive and more critical of its intents and activities.

The Goodrich Administration

The Goodrich Program began as a plan of the CPACS Dean in 1972 and retained a close working relationship and an identity with him as leader for as long as he remained in office. Currently, however, even though its administrative arrangement is nominally the same, the acknowledged leader of the Program is now its Director. This subtle shift which has placed the CPACS Dean in his appropriate administrative role vis-a-vis Goodrich i.e. representative of the whole College to the central administration, does not appear to have yet been totally accepted by the Goodrich staff and faculty, who remember a period of unstinting support from CPACS administration; and tend at times to interpret normal and appropriate administrative controls as the raising of obstacles.

Currently the chief advocate and liason for Goodrich and CPACS and the University is the Director of Goodrich and not the Dean of CPACS whose primary area of responsibility is a wider sphere. The Dean can now appropriately be expected to review Goodrich actions in the light of broader CPACS and University concerns; and the tension which sometimes results should be viewed as the result of normal intra-system conflict. The level of that tension appears at this time to be

manageable and to serve as a sign of Goodrich's maturing status as an administrative unit.

For CPACS, the administrative evolution of Goodrich raises the important question of whether or not Goodrich should be accorded equal status with the other departments and programs of CPACS. That it is not yet so considered is suggested by the fact that, in the 1976 accreditation Self-Study, Goodrich is not listed along with the other programs of CPACS under the section on Public Service. Yet Goodrich is one of the University's more successful public service efforts; and CPACS, as its administrative home, should receive some credit for that success.

One requirement of maturing departmental status for Goodrich (and it seems clear that the Program more and more identifies itself as such) would be providing sufficient assistance to the Goodrich Director to enable her to concentrate on administrative and liaison duties. Her current workload appears too much involved with advisement, teaching, and paper-work activities to permit sufficient time for managing the Program and building relationships with the rest of the University. While it is not possible to specify exactly how much extra help should be made available (and the answer does seem to lie in extra assistance rather than in her cutting back on advisement or teaching), it seems reasonable for the Goodrich Director to have at least as much clerical and administrative assistance as any other CPACS department.

Questions which need to be addressed frankly and openly both with Goodrich and between Goodrich and CPACS include:

1. How much involvement should Goodrich faculty have in CPACS policy-making?

2. How much involvement should CPACS faculty have in Goodrich policy-making?

3. To what extent should Goodrich consider CPACS needs and concerns in organizing its Program, e.g. selection of faculty, invitations to external speakers, etc.?

The Goodrich curriculum and its faculty tend, by virtue of the initial design of the Program and the selection of faculty as well as by the general atmosphere surrounding undergraduate education at UNO, to be more identified with the College of Arts and Sciences than with CPACS. Goodrich courses, particularly during the first year are designed to emphasize the academic rather than the professional dimensions; and are seen as contributing to the student's general education rather than primarily to vocational preparation. The Goodrich faculty are, by background and interest, oriented more toward the academic disciplines (with a few exceptions) and bring an orientation to their teaching that sees social involvement as a means to academic understanding rather than vice-versa.

The question of whether or not the Goodrich emphasis and the orientation of its faculty are congruent with those of CPACS is of concern to the CPACS administration for the very practical reason that productivity is measured in part by the number of students who major in CPACS fields. Bluntly put, if CPACS resources are being used to generate primarily Arts and Science majors, then some reallocation of those resources would inevitably be considered.

The reaction of Goodrich to this concern is varied, ranging from the traditional academician's view that the eventual major of a student is a purely educational issue which should not be permitted to

have administrative overtones, least of all budgetary ones; to a strong sense that Goodrich students do tend to seek majors in CPACS fields, in at least as high a proportion as they seek other fields.

Insofar as the facts can be determined, they show that Education, more than Arts and Sciences is the beneficiary of Goodrich majors. Table 4.1 shows that a large number of Goodrich students have already tentatively identified the College in which they will probably major. The College of Education (29.1%) and Arts and Sciences (24.1%) are currently the areas of most frequent choice, CPACS currently receives 10.8% of the students who have made such a declaration. Such a finding should allay the concerns of CPACS since a proportion of that magnitude appears reasonable at an early stage in the student's career. Nevertheless, clearer understanding on the part of CPACS about what actually happens in the Goodrich curriculum would reassure them further that the goals and methods of both Goodrich and CPACS are compatible.

Goodrich and the University

There is a subtle but important anomaly in the way Goodrich is defined administratively by the University central administration that has implications for the Program's continued development. There is no question about University support for Goodrich, but its status seems somewhat shakier than it might due to the contradiction in how it is defined.

The anomaly grows out of the term "scholarship program" by which Goodrich is designated. As a "scholarship" Goodrich is part of student services, a form of financial aid that is a specially targeted part of a student's "aid package". The fact of being seen as a form

of student aid, a "scholarship," focuses attention on its components from the student services divisions of the Universities. On the other hand the Goodrich Program is an innovative educational unit, an experimental academic unit with courses, faculty, and staff and with aspirations to being seen as and treated as a full-fledged academic department.

Two problems arise from this dual identification, both related to the allocation of resources, the survival of the Program, and its ability to provide the unique services that have proven so effective.

The first problem concerns the place of the Study Skills Center in the Goodrich Program, the services it can provide to the rest of the University, and the form that such services might best take. The Center has clearly been an attractive and successful element in Goodrich. In it have been developed a number of innovative and effective approaches to helping students with study problems. These approaches the University can benefit from.

An early suggestion and an initial attempt to move the Center's activities away from Goodrich was met in 1977 with strong resistance and was abandoned. The rationale behind the move was apparently to have the rest of the University benefit from what was working at Goodrich. The rationale seems appropriate, the method--frankly--ill-advised. Certain qualities, critical to the success of the Study Skills Center, could not in all probability be achieved if it were part of a larger administrative unit and were expected to serve more students. These elements are its size and the direct involvement of Goodrich faculty. What must clearly be understood is that the success of the Study Skills Center in Goodrich depends on its not being a

student service but an integral part of the Goodrich curriculum. To remove it in any way from that position is to vitiate its effectiveness; and, in great likelihood, that of the Goodrich curriculum.

What can and should be done is to call upon the developers of the Goodrich Study Skills Center to assist in the establishment of other such centers on campus and to provide to similar centers in academic departments the methods that have proven successful in Goodrich.

In a larger sense, this view suggests that a program such as the Goodrich Study Skills Center best serves students outside its immediate sphere by providing ideas and not direct service.

The second problem of the relation between Goodrich and the larger university also concerns its status as something between a student service and an academic department; and particularly how that status affects its faculty. Currently the Goodrich faculty occupy ambiguous positions, each one identifying both with an academic department and with the Goodrich Program. There are aspects of this problem that are of personal concern to faculty, such as how important publishing is relative to teaching, and how critical a doctorate is as a terminal degree. On these questions the University seems clearly to have taken a stand; one which Goodrich faculty accept if not espouse. But of more concern in this context is the University's rationale for demanding traditional credentials for faculty. The argument used for considering whether or not to promote faculty included the question of whether or not, "in the event Goodrich were dissolved," faculty could be accepted by traditional departments. The fact that, after five years, the Goodrich Program has yet to gain an image of

permanency is a cause for some concern.

As shown in Table 4.2, Goodrich costs are not excessive in relation to overall costs at UNO, National averages, and innovative programs generally. In addition they have remained generally stable over the years. Certainly an innovative program expects to be tentative and to face stringent tests of its right to survive. By their very nature, experimental programs often are discontinued, usually because they have failed or because the problem they were initiated to address has vanished. Some such programs thrive on their temporariness and view demise as a natural result of evolution. But Goodrich has neither failed nor has the problem it addresses been resolved. The question arises, and demands attention if not solution, of how long Goodrich must be successful before it can be accepted as a permanent part of the University. It will probably persist as long as its direct ties to legislative intent and priority, in the person of Senator Goodrich, remain. But a program of its general effectiveness, addressing a real societal need, should certainly have more stable administrative status.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, ISSUES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation has sought to develop a comprehensive picture of the impact of the Goodrich Program on those it was designed to serve, in order to make suggestions for its continued development. To present as complete a picture as possible, these elements of the Program which contribute to its impact on students and which can help explain that impact have also been included. These contributing elements fall roughly into three separate but interrelated categories:

A. Program Resources--including the entering students, faculty and staff, physical facilities, and finances.

B. Program Processes--including the curriculum, the teaching and advisement practices, and the administrative functions.

C. Program Outcomes--including the Program's fulfillment of its educational and social objectives, its admission and retention of low-income students, and its success in contributing to their educational development.

To assess these elements several different forms of evidence have been gathered and analyzed, including psychometric tests, self-report via interviews and questionnaires, document analysis, and direct observation. The grounds on which evaluative judgments have been made from this evidence include:

A. The sense of the experience of those involved in the Program, a sense of "how it feels."

B. The internal logic of the various components in relation to current theory and practice in higher education.

C. The actual changes wrought in students in relation to the Program's objectives.

To as great an extent as possible, the grounds for evaluative judgments as well as the logic that led to them have been made transparent; but it must frankly be stated that in the final analysis the judgments are those of the evaluator, the results of applying disciplined judgment to a complex of disparate data. As such, of course, any conclusions and recommendations are open to question; and, as part of the reporting process, an opportunity has been afforded to all involved to review and critique the report in draft form and to suggest clarifications and alternative interpretations. Insofar as is feasible, these critiques are reflected in this report.

The Findings

The Goodrich Program appears to be achieving its objectives of providing effective access to a college education for low-income students.

The student experience in Goodrich appears strongly positive. Goodrich students are particularly impressed by the personal treatment they receive from faculty, and by the availability of intensive individualized assistance.

There appears to be ambivalence among faculty about the relative importance of teaching vs. research in the career advancement of Goodrich faculty, a conflict common to faculty in innovative programs for undergraduates. Since the UNO seems committed to increasingly more importance of research, some accommodation by the Goodrich faculty to this ideal would appear necessary. For such accommodation to take place without lessening the commitment to teaching will

require much careful thought and negotiation.

Goodrich students experience a well-thought out and well-coordinated liberal arts curriculum that challenges them and provides attractive stimulation. This curriculum meets the highest standards of academic quality and yet is so designed as to be relevant to the student's social concerns.

A wide variety of teaching approaches are used with what appears to be generally high quality. This is due to careful selection of faculty, their high degree of commitment to teaching, and much constructive interaction among faculty regarding teaching ideals and practices.

The Study Skills Center is a particularly important element of the Goodrich Program and appears to be well-organized and to be providing excellent services to students. Some questions have been raised about its capacity to serve students other than those in the Goodrich Program. While it can serve as an excellent model for other such programs, it is clear that its centrality to the Goodrich Program should not be underestimated.

It's cost, while higher than average for the University, has remained stable over the years; and is not unusual since special programs are appropriately high cost.

The retention rate of those admitted to Goodrich is substantially higher than that of UNO students generally, even though the students admitted to Goodrich are among those traditionally considered to be higher risks.

Issues and Problems

The development of any innovative program involves the solution of problems and the resolution of issues throughout its developing years. As a new program grows, establishes its identity and legitimacy, and moves toward a stable position in the institution, the problems and issues it faces change. Goodrich appears to have become legitimate, to have proven itself, and to have become accepted. Certain issues remain to be resolved, however, These involve admission, faculty research, counseling services, service to third and fourth-year students, natural science program, and various student suggestions for change.

A. Admissions. Currently the Goodrich policy is to admit students to the Program on the basis of financial need and an interview in which factors other than traditional academic performance are given heavier weighting. While this approach does not exclude those who are academically strong, it does tend to increase the chances of students who show evidence of high motivation, leadership, and successful life experience. As knowledge of Goodrich spreads, it is likely that more and more qualified low-income students will apply. There are two ways in which such an increase of applications may affect the program and the implications of such developments should be considered.

First, as the Program increases in size, its capacity to deal personally with students may be inhibited. In 1977, because of a special increase in the legislative appropriation, approximately 30 additional students more were admitted to the Program. While the social desirability of such increased access is unquestioned, the ability of a program such as Goodrich to handle such an increase of

students without losing its special quality becomes problematic. The dilemma is a real one and needs to be given active consideration since the Goodrich objective is success, not simply access.

Second, the admission process has so far given educational opportunity to significantly more Afro-Americans and significantly more women; but the number of Chicano and Native-American applicants remain small. Serious effort must be undertaken to redress this imbalance.

Third, since faculty also feel that a mix of academic ability in the classroom is more beneficial to students with lower initial skill levels, some attention needs to be devoted to the question of student selection criteria. A list of the different criteria used should be developed and decisions made about the appropriate weighting of each. The selection process itself, with its joint review of student applications by several members of the Goodrich staff, is an appropriate one and should be continued. The composition of such a selection board should, if possible, include current and/or former Goodrich students.

B. Faculty Research. The current Goodrich faculty appears to be all competent teachers, and well-versed in their disciplines. The innovative nature of the Goodrich Program, with its heavy demand on faculty time and energy and a certain ambivalence about the University's traditional commitment to research, have placed Goodrich faculty members in a somewhat ambiguous position. Since each faculty member is both a member of Goodrich (which pays the salary) and is affiliated with a discipline department, a potential conflict of commitments sometimes results. The discipline departments generally support the faculty member's involvement with Goodrich, but subtly expect a commitment to research as well. Goodrich, in the view of some faculty,

is less supportive of the faculty member's discipline commitment, however, and research productivity may suffer. One potential solution that has not yet received sufficient attention--and should--is the carrying out of research and writing in conjunction with Goodrich activities. The Goodrich faculty have only begun to realize how important the innovations are with which they have become involved; and should begin to consider publications and research dealing with their work in Goodrich.

C. Counseling Services. The Goodrich Program, being small and close-knit, has generally used faculty and the regular administrative staff to counsel students on a wide range of problems. As the program has developed, more and more students are taxing its resources for such assistance, and some need exists to examine just how that assistance should be pro ided. The arguments for such a focused counseling approach, as opposed to having Goodrich students make use of regular University services are:

1. That Goodrich students are less likely to use on benefit from the regular University Services, which often involve considerable "red-tape".

2. That minority student concerns are better handled in a unit that has a special commitment to them.

3. That low-income students entering Goodrich need more specialized counseling by persons attuned to their alienation.

4. That the Goodrich Program itself is primarily oriented to academic concerns (and should be) leaves other student concerns and needs largely unmet. Such needs include:

a) Individual personal counseling

b) Referral to other agencies

c) Job referral

d) Financial problems

e) Career information

Goodrich has proposed a plan for a Developmental counseling service which, if developed, would be comprehensive (Appendix D). Whether or not it duplicates other University Services or would require too many resources are issues that the Program, CPACS, and the University must address.

D. Third and Fourth Year Students. For all practical purposes a dichotomy exists between the Goodrich "scholarship" which is a four-year tuition grant; and the Goodrich scholarship "Program" which engages students for only their first two years. Original suggestions for the Goodrich Program included formal third and fourth-year activities, and some attempts are currently being made to stay in touch with students after the first two years, but by and large such efforts have failed. This is a cause of some concern for both Goodrich and CPACS.

But should it be? Should the special curriculum and special faculty services really extend beyond two years? There is some indication in the logic of the Program, in students' comments, and in the very nature of student development that would suggest services for more than two years to be less than optimally productive.

1. Comments from third and fourth year students who were interviewed indicate that the Program remains available, and that they would feel free to use it; but that schedule problems, distance, and other interests tend to diminish involvement.

2. Other comments suggest that after 2 years the intensity of Goodrich becomes uncomfortable. This is a common occurrence in small, highly group-oriented programs, as students begin quite naturally after a time to want more privacy. As one student said:

> "Students get tired of Goodrich after the first two years. A few carry on but most don't."

Another put it:

> "The student-faculty relationships is like a child with its mother. In Junior and Senior year they try to break away like a child. They only come back when they need something."

3. The Goodrich aim is to make students self-reliant, to develop in them the skills and confidence to succeed in the larger University. One indicator of Program success may be that students find it less and less useful over time. Those who do return, do so to use its services but do not seem to need the intensive support and assistance. They have left the nest and can fly on their own. As one student put it:

> "I am satisfied with my own work. I feel that I don't need that extra help."

So perhaps the distinction between Scholarship and Program is valid and no concerted attempts to hold students close after two years should be made. Availability of help may well be sufficient.

E. Natural Science Program. The original Goodrich Plan envisioned a natural science component that has never been implemented. Unavailability of faculty and full attention to the development of the Humanities and Social Science components have been cited as major reasons. Yet the importance of an opportunity for low-income and ethnic minority students to enter the natural and biological sciences cannot be over-stated.

To recommend simply that such a component be added to the Program would be simplistic and probably not very practical. Faculty would support an integrated introduction to the Natural and Biological sciences as a course for Goodrich students; but such a course would be oriented more to the social impact of science as befits the total thrust of the curriculum. While valuable, that kind of course would not adequately prepare minority students for the rigor of professional majors. If, as stated above, Goodrich has little influence after the first two years, it is difficult to see how a program geared to science majors would be successful.

Another approach has been suggested however, and is worthy of consideration. That is to extend the Goodrich Program downward, into the high schools. The Goodrich Director has already begun work on the design of a program to identify and guide qualified minority high school students toward preparation for the natural and biological sciences. The details of such a program would of course be difficult to work out, but the idea has much to recommend it:

1. Goodrich has already developed the mechanisms for testing and tutoring that such a program would need.

2. Goodrich has established a reputation in the Omaha community that would give its effort legitimacy.

3. The Program would benefit Goodrich and the University by identifying potential students at a time in their education when skill training might be preventive of academic problems rather than remedial.

4. A program such as this would fit UNO's commitment to community service and would establish a new situation in which Senator Goodrich's strategy of using education to break the poverty chain could be implemented.

Recommendations for the Future

1. Intensive efforts should be continued to recruit Native American and Chicano students; seeking to detect ways by which the University can be more responsive to their cultural heritage and thus enhance their probability of success. To this end, careful study should be undertaken of what factors currently militate against their retention and completion.

2. Goodrich student withdrawals from non-Goodrich courses should be closely monitored to detect early patterns that may lead to withdrawal from the entire program. At the same time, however, it should be understood that withdrawal to prevent confidence-shattering failure may be, in the long run, a desirable activity.

3. Attention should be paid to enlisting students in the attempt to increase the prestige of the Goodrich Program on the UNO campus. They may well be its most persuasive spokespersons.

4. Concerted attention should be given to securing from the UNO School of Education recognition and acceptance of Goodrich credits toward Education pre-major requirements. Since such a substantial proportion of students in Goodrich intend to become education majors, this lack of acceptance poses an undue hardship on them.

5. More attention should be paid by faculty to applying the skills and knowledge learned by students in one course to the problems of another. Particularly the course in Critical Reasoning should be oriented more, by selection of examples and class projects, to both the Humanities and Social Science courses. More discussion to that end among faculty responsible for the courses should be encouraged.

6. The orientation of part of the social science sequence to raising consciousness about prejudice should continue. Efforts to reduce white defensiveness in discussing racial prejudice should be increased by expanding the scope of discussion; and to take account of prejudice toward other minorities by including it in class examples should be increased, but should not become overly stressed.

7. The Study Skills Center library should include books and articles designed to stimulate student <u>interest</u> in academic subjects.

8. The ideas of the Study Skills Center should be replicated in other parts of the University; but under no circumstances should the Center itself be removed administratively from Goodrich.

9. A plan should be developed to give state and national publicity to the Goodrich Scholarship Program, as a successful example of increased access to college for low-income and minority students without a loss of academic quality.

10. A system should be developed for charting student-flow throughout the institution which incorporates data about Goodrich students. Such a flow system should begin at the point a student enters UNO and should follow him/her through the institution and even beyond into employment.

11. Student evaluation of teaching should be conveyed by graduate assistants to professors in open-ended ways. A system incorporating such evaluation should replace current student questionnaires.

APPENDIX A

PROCEDURES OF THE EVALUATION

PROCEDURES OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this section is to describe the different data gathering and analytic procedures that were used in the evaluation. They are presented in a separate appendix to avoid interrupting the flow of the analysis and reporting of results; and to make the technical aspects of the study clearer. Included are copies of interview schedules, references to structured tests, and descriptions of the circumstances under which data were collected and analyzed.

Information Collected

University Records

1. Demographic information about Goodrich students drawn from the University Central Student Files, Fall 1976.

2. Comparative grading analysis of Goodrich students in non-Goodrich courses, drawn from University Course/Grade File, January, 1977.

3. Cumulative grade point average for Goodrich students, drawn from University Grade File, May, 1977.

4. Records of Goodrich students progress through program including enrollment, graduation, and withdrawal; prepared from Goodrich files by Program Staff, June, 1977.

These records were inspected and used to prepare basic charts and tables for the report.

Psychometric Instruments

1. College Student Questionnaire, Part I and Part II, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. Parts I were administered to all Goodrich students and to two groups of non-Goodrich students enrolled in two sections of Introduction to Philosophy. Part II was administered several months

later to the same groups, but a low response rate in the follow-up sample made it necessary to alter the way in which the tests were analyzed and used.

For items repeated on Parts I and II, the data were combined into one set. For items appearing only in Part II, the results for Goodrich students only are reported because the follow-up response rate of non-Goodrich students was insufficient.

Because of this modification, inferences about changes in student attitudes are based upon cross-sectional rather than longitudinal analyses. As pointed out by Feldman and Newcomb (1969, p. 152 ff) in their monumental work on the impact of college upon students, such cross-sectional analyses are inherently weaker than longitudinal analyses but in general tend to support the same conclusions.

2. Goodrich Program Demographic and Alienation Questionnaire. This instrument, designed by Franklin Zweig, was administered to all Goodrich students and to a selected sample of non-Goodrich students. The data were analyzed to provide comparisons of Goodrich and non-Goodrich students on attitudes that might suggest patterns of alienation. These data were used primarily to suggest areas of strength in the Goodrich Program and to suggest hypotheses for elaboration and testing by means of the student interview.

3. Critical Reasoning Test. This teacher-made test, prepared by two professors in the Goodrich Program was administered to both Goodrich and non-Goodrich students. Results were used to compare the performance of students in areas believed to be important to college level thinking, including skill in logical analysis and theory assessment.

4. Cornell Learning and Study Skills Inventory--College Form (Classic). This instrument tests student perception of their own ability with regard to factors considered critical for learning. Such factors include Goal Orientation, Activity Structure, Lecture Mastery, Textbook Mastery, Examination Mastery, and Self Mastery. The instrument was administered to students taking part in the Goodrich Study Skills Center. Comparisons are made between these students and national college norms to suggest how Goodrich student self-perceptions differ from typical American college students.

Interviews

A series of interviews with Goodrich faculty, staff, and students, with UNO officials, and with external constituencies provided the bulk of qualitative information used in the evaluation. These interviews

were of four kinds:

1. Open-ended interviews by the evaluator with faculty, staff, and students to gain general insight into the nature of the Goodrich Program, its impact upon students, and its relation to the rest of the University.

2. Focused interviews by the evaluator with Goodrich faculty and staff to assess

   a) the Goodrich curriculum and how it affects students

   b) appropriate roles, qualifications, and credentials for Goodrich faculty

   c) strengths and weaknesses of the Program and suggestions for improvement

3. Open-ended interviews with students by students. Eight former Goodrich students were selected to serve as interviewers of current Goodrich students: The interviewers were trained according to procedures developed by the evaluator and implemented by the Goodrich staff. Forty-eight current students were chosen at random and invited to discuss their experiences in the Goodrich Program. Each interview lasted approximately 25-30 minutes and was tape-recorded. The recordings were then analyzed by the evaluator. Questions asked the students included:

   a) What stands out in your Goodrich experience?

   b) How has the Program changed you? Academically, socially, culturally?

   c) What differences are there between Goodrich courses and those in the rest of the institution?

   d) What characteristics should a Goodrich instructor have?

   e) What have been your experiences with the Study Skills Center?

   f) What aspects of Goodrich should be changed?

   Results of these interviews elaborated and enriched the analysis of quantitative data, as well as provided qualitative support for evaluation inferences.

4. Informal personal and telephone interviews. Throughout the project numerous such informal discussions were held between the evaluator and Goodrich personnel for the purpose of elucidating and clarifying issues as they arose.

Other

Various additional modes of information gathering were used during the course of the study, all oriented to providing the evaluator with as clear and full a picture of the Goodrich Program as possible. These modes included:

1. Group discussions with faculty, staff, students and administrators.
2. Observation of Goodrich classes and support services in operation.
3. Examination of documents describing the Program and logs of both faculty and student activities.
4. Examination of student products such as papers and projects.

Sampling Procedures

For most of the information gathered about Goodrich students the entire class of Goodrich students were administered the instruments. The difficulties of finding students after the first two years and the ordinary exigencies of data-gathering led to non-response in some cases but for the most part sample sizes are large enough so that missing data from Goodrich students should not be considered a significant problem.

For comparison groups of non-Goodrich students however other difficulties occurred which were more serious and which make the drawing of comparative inferences somewhat more tentative.

It was necessary first of all to gather the data from intact classes and these cannot ordinarily be considered as representative of all non-Goodrich students. The classes that were chosen however, were those in the same year and of the same general makeup as ordinary Goodrich students. Although it is possible certain systematic biases

exist in these groups there is no logical grounds for assuming that the non-Goodrich students assessed are substantially different from other non-Goodrich students.

Nevertheless the lack of random sampling must be considered as a limitation of this evaluation for the kinds of comparisons that are drawn. For this reason inferences drawn from such comparisons were tentative and were seen as hypotheses for further test rather than as conclusions. It should be remembered that the general inferences to be drawn are inferences to the entire UNO and to the entire Goodrich Program. Consequently the various samples that are drawn for the different tests each contribute different estimates of the total populations. The fact that for different data gathering instruments the non-Goodrich samples are of different students strengthens rather than weakens the capacity of the estimates to reflect the true population parameters. There is, however, no way of systematically assessing the extent to which these different samples adequately estimate. For this reason inferences remained tentative; and in all cases where inferences are drawn from the empirical data about Goodrich students and about non-Goodrich students these were enhanced and clarified by references to the interview information.

General

The conclusions and suggestions of this evaluation, though based upon the data gathered and derived from as rigorous analyses as possible, remain ultimately the judgments (and therefore the responsibility) of the evaluator. Differing viewpoints and critiques of this report are necessary and welcome. In this way the study may serve to extend and enhance the development of the Program.

TEXT OF COVERING LETTER

Please take note that the following material requests from you an identifying number. The purpose of the number is to permit the researchers to contact you if necessary regarding follow-up or supplementary material. The roster of numbers is confidential and will remain the exclusive control of research people employed by the Goodrich Scholarship Program.

You are hereby notified that your submission of an identifying number is a voluntary act on your part. You have every legal right and prerogative to withhold such information. If you do not wish to provide such information, you may omit it. Your submission of the number will indicate your freely given consent to its inclusion in the research.

You are further notified that any information provided by you is voluntary. You may omit any or all questions. You have every legal right and prerogative to do so. Your provision of information will indicate your freely given consent, absent any compulsion, to do so.

The best evaluation of educational programs depends upon the quality of responses from students. Accordingly, we hope that you will participate to the greatest extent possible in answering the accompanying questionnaire. To the extent you are willing to voluntarily contribute the information requested, the University community will be grateful for your assistance.

The information requested has no bearing upon University administration or faculty evaluation of students. Its sole purpose is to evaluate the educational experience of students. We appreciate your time and your consideration of this request.

The Goodrich Scholarship Program
College of Public Affairs and
Community Service

1. Social Security Number _____

2. Address _____
(City) (State) (ZIP)

3. High School from which you graduated _____

4. Age (at last birthday) _____

5. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

6. Marital Status: Single _____ Married _____ Widowed _____
Separated _____ Divorced _____ Engaged or Going Steady _____

7. Place of Birth _____
(County) (State) (City or Town)

8. Number of children dependent on you for financial support _____

9. Number of persons dependent on you for their housing or residence _____

10. If you live at the home of your parents, please specify the number of students in your home dependent upon parents or others for financial support _____

11. If you are married, please specify the number of persons dependent upon you and your spouse for financial support _____

WORK STATUS

12. Kind of work _____

13. Number of hours you work per week _____

14. How long have you worked in this capacity? ____months ____weeks

FAMILY STATUS

Indicate persons living in your home.

15. One parent _____
16. Two parents _____
17. Other head of house _____
18. Brothers (specify ages) _____
19. Sisters (specify ages) _____
20. Your natural or adopted children: Sons (ages) _____
Daughters (ages) _____
21. Your spouse _____
22. Others (please list in terms of their relationship to you (e.g., friend, etc.) _____

_____

EDUCATION

23. Major area (anticipated or chosen) _____

24. Minor area (anticipated or chosen) _____

25. Number of credit hours currently enrolled _____

INCOME AND OCCUPATION

26. Occupation of your father, stepfather, or male guardian

_____

Annual Income:

27. Occupation of your mother, stepmother, or female guardian

_____

Annual Income:

28. If married, occupation of your spouse _____

Annual Income:

29. Please indicate as closely as possible your total family or household income:

30. Do you now live in a home which is: owned_____ rented_____

31. How many years have you lived at your present address?_____

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

32. Please check highest educational level obtained by your father, stepfather, or male guardian:

Did not complete 8 years of elementary school _____

Completed 8 years of elementary school _____

Completed high school _____

Began college _____

Completed college _____

Other (please specify)_____

33. Please check highest educational level obtained by your mother, stepmother, or female guardian:

Did not complete 8 years of elementary school _____

Completed 8 years of elementary school _____

Completed high school _____

Began college _____

Completed college _____

Other (please specify)_____

34. Number of brothers or sisters who began college.

TRANSPORTATION

35. Do you own your own car? _____

If so, specify model_____ and year _____

36. Do you have access to family car(s) for travel to UNO?_____

37. Do you ride the bus regularly to UNO?_____

ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Please check one of the following categories that applies to you:

RACE:

38. Afro-American_____ Asian-American_____ Latin-American_____

Anglo-American_____ Native American_____

Other (please specify)_____

39. Please write your description of the racial group with which you identify yourself: _____

_____

RELIGION

40. Roman Catholic_____ Other Catholic_____ Protestant_____

Other Christian (please specify)_____ Jewish_____

Islamic_____ Hindu_____

Other (please specify)_____

No formal religious affiliation_____

NATIONAL ORIGIN

41. Please indicate the country (if known) or area of the world your most recent paternal ancestor came from when immigrating to the United States _____

_____

42. Please indicate the country (if known) or area of the world your most recent maternal ancestor came from when immigrating to the United States _____

_____

First Questionnaire Form

As the first step in our attempt to evaluate some important aspects of the effect of university experiences upon students, we have prepared the following group of questions. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Each is an individual's choice and is to be accorded respect. By the same token, it is hoped that each student responding to these questions will answer with seriousness of purpose. The objective of this evaluation is to improve the quality of your university experience. Systematic, anonymous feedback such as provided in this questionnaire can be most helpful to faculty, administration and students alike.

Below are some statements regarding university issues with which you may agree or disagree. Please register your feelings regarding these statements, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the statements as they stand. Please complete every item.

Please check in the appropriate blank as follows:

_____ SA (STRONGLY AGREE)

_____ A (AGREE)

_____ U (UNCERTAIN)

_____ D (DISAGREE)

_____ SD (STRONGLY DISAGREE)

1. The size and complexity of this University make it very difficult for a student to know where to turn.

   SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

2. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens within this University.

   SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

3. I find that individual classes provide for the personal needs and interests of the student.

   SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

4. The faculty has too much control over the lives of students at this University.

   SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

5. The bureaucracy of this University has me confused and bewildered.

   SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

6. I feel that I am an integral part of this University community.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

7. Things have become so compiicated within this University that I really do not understand just what is going on.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

8. I seldom feel "lost" or "alone" within the social system of this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

9. Students are just so many cogs in the machinery of this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

10. I do not have as many friends as I would like at this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

11. Most of the time I feel I have an effective voice in the decisions regarding my destiny at this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

12. Life within the social system of this University is so chaotic that the student really does not know where to turn.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

13. Many students within this University are lonely and unrelated to their fellow human beings.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

14. More and more, I feel helpless in the face of what is happening within this University today.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

15. The forces affecting me within this University are so complex and confusing that I find it difficult to effectively make decisions.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

16. I can't seem to make much sense out of my University experience.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

17. My experience at this University has been devoid of any meaningful relationships.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

18. The administration has too much control over my life at this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

19. This University is run by a few people in power and there is not much the student can do about it.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

20. The student has little chance of protecting his personal interests when they conflict with those of this University.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

21. In spite of the fast pace of this University, it is easy to make many close friends that you can really count on.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

22. My life is so confusing at this University that I hardly know what to expect from day to day.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

23. In this fast changing University, with so much different information available, it is difficult to think clearly about many issues.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

24. This University is just too big and impersonal to provide for the individual student.

SA_____ A_____ U_____ D_____ SD_____

APPENDIX B

TABLES OF RESULTS

TABLE 1.1

RACE AND SEX OF GOODRICH STUDENTS

BY YEAR

Male	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Total
Afro-American	10	7	2	9	28
Chicano	1	3	3	3	10
Caucasian	9	4	8	11	32
Native-American	1	1	0	2	4
Asian-American	0	0	0	0	0
Total	21	15	13	25	74
Female					
Afro-American	9	16	14	14	53
Chicano	5	2	9	2	10
Caucasian	12	14	9	16	51
Native-American	3	1	0	0	4
Asian-American	0	1	0	0	1
Total	29	34	24	32	119
Total by Year	50	49	37	57	193

TABLE 1.2

COMPARATIVE GRADING PERFORMANCE OF GOODRICH STUDENTS

IN NON-GOODRICH COURSES 1974-1976

	Total	A	B	C	D	F	Pass	Fail	I	WD
Humanities	835	191	154	159	46	89	25	14	30	127
Natural Sciences	268	25	63	62	22	27	5	8	2	54
Business Administration	161	11	26	34	17	19	1	-	4	49
Education	313	63	96	46	11	18	19	-	13	47
Engineering	28	5	8	5	7	-	-	-	-	3
Public Affairs & Community Service	77	7	12	19	4	9	16	4	6	-
Fine Arts	131	37	25	30	4	13	1	-	2	19

TABLE 1.3

COMPARATIVE GRADING PERFORMANCE OF GOODRICH

STUDENTS IN NON-GOODRICH COURSES

	A	B[1]	C	D	F[2]	Inc	Wd	Total
Non-Goodrich Courses	339	451	355	111	201	57	299	1813
Percent (%)	18.7	24.9	19.6	6.1	11.1	3.1	16.5	100
Goodrich Courses	138	175	115	32	30	41	32	563
Percent (%)	24.5	31.1	20.1	5.7	5.3	7.3	7.3	100

NOTE: [1]includes pass grades

[2]includes fail grades

TABLE 1.4

COMPARATIVE SCORES ON CORNELL LEARNING AND STUDY SKILLS INVENTORY--COLLEGE FORM

			Goodrich Students (N=72)	College Norms* (N=1610)	Comparison Index**
I.	Goal Orientation	M	50.9	50.2	1.014
		SD	5.1	5.6	
II.	Activity Structure	M	58.0	55.3	1.094
		SD	8.9	8.6	
III.	Scholarly Skills	M	65.0	65.1	.998
		SD	8.9	8.5	
IV.	Lecture Mastery	M	58.3	56.5	1.027
		SD	7.0	6.56	
V.	Textbook Mastery	M	72.1	68.8	1.048
		SD	10.9	9.8	
VI.	Examination Mastery	M	50.5	50.2	1.006
		SD	7.9	6.8	
VII.	Self-Mastery	M	60.8	62.5	.973
		SD	9.6	8.3	
VIII.	Total Study Efficiency	M	41.2	40.9	1.007
		SD	4.1	3.8	
IX.	Reading Validity Index	M	77.7	77.5	1.002
		SD	8.5	8.9	

* Cassell, R. N. and Pauk, W. J. Manual for the Cornell Learning and Study Skill Inventory. Jacksonville, Illinois: Psychologists and Educators Press, p. 26 (ca. 1973).

**Comparison Index = $\frac{\text{Program (Goodrich}}{\text{Base (College Norms)}}$

TABLE 1.5

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE ON CRITICAL REASONING TESTS

DECEMBER, 1975

Part A		Goodrich (N=45)	Non-Goodrich (N=74)	Total t (df=117)	P
Definitions	M	9.20	10.82	-2.25	.026
	SD	3.94	3.75		
Premises & Conclusions	M	10.33	11.62	-1.66	.100
	SD	4.40	3.92		
Fallacies	M	11.38	11.03	.48	.629
	SD	3.75	3.86		
Translation to Logic Symbols	M	8.22	9.03	-1.40	.164
	SD	3.27	2.90		
Truth Tables	M	7.44	7.64	-.35	.720
	SD	2.65	3.19		
Total Score Part A	M	46.60	49.93	-1.44	.153
	SD	11.96	12.42		
Part B		**(N=45)**	**(N=6)**	**(df=49)**	
Conceptual Theories	M	14.87	14.18	.90	.371
	SD	1.78	1.84		
Empirical Theories	M	9.49	10.50	-.83	.512
	SD	2.87	2.18		
Total Score Part B	M	24.36	24.67	-.20	.845
	SD	3.74	3.01		
Total A & B	M	70.91			
	SD	13.84			

TABLE 1.6
GOODRICH ENROLLMENT STATISTICS

Class of		F 72	S 73	F 73	S 74	F 74	S 75	F 75	S 76	F 76	S 77
72	Enrolled (continuing)	94	94	91	80	71	63	58	48	42	21
	Entered that semester or readmitted	--	17	4	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Graduated	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	15	5
	Withdrew	--	20	15	11	8	5	10	3	6	2
73	Enrolled (continuing)			59	59	65	60	57	52	47	38
	Entered that semester or readmitted			--	10	--	1	1	--	--	--
	Graduated			--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3
	Withdrew			--	4	5	4	6	5	8	1
74	Enrolled (continuing)					46	46	40	36	38	35
	Entered that semester or readmitted					--	3	--	6	1	1
	Graduated					--	--	--	--	--	--
	Withdrew					--	9	4	4	4	1
75	Enrolled (continuing)							54	54	55	49
	Entered that semester or readmitted							--	8	1	--
	Graduated							--	--	--	--
	Withdrew							--	7	7	3
76	Enrolled (continuing)									59	50
	Entered that semester or readmitted									--	6
	Graduated									--	--
	Withdrew									--	2
	Total Enrolled	94	94	150	139	182	169	209	190	232	193
	Total Entered		17	4	12	---	4	1	14	2	7
	Graduated								3	16	8
	Withdrew		20	15	15	13	18	20	19	25	9
	Average Attrition/year (%)		18.0		18.1		16.7		17.4		14.1

TABLE 1.7

CUMULATIVE ATTRITION RATES FOR

EACH GOODRICH CLASS

	1972/73 %	1973/74 %	1974/75 %	1975/76 %	1976/77 %	Average Change %
1972	18.0	41.4	53.2	64.9	72.1	13.5
1973		5.8	18.6	33.8	46.5	13.5
1974			18.4	32.7	40.7	11.2
1975				11.3	27.0	15.7
1976					3.6	
Average/year	18.0*	18.1	16.7	17.4	14.1	
Cumulative** Attrition Rate	18.0	27.2	35.4	41.2	44.4	

* Calculated as total yearly withdrawals/total yearly enrollment
**Calculated as cumulative withdrawal/cumulative enrollment

TABLE 1.8

GRADUATES OF THE GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

		1975	1976	1977	Total
Number of Graduates		3	25	12	40
Sex	Men	-	4	6	10
	Women	3	22	6	30
College of Degree					
	CPACS	-	9	3	12
	Education	2	9	3	12
	Business Administration	-	3	2	5
	Arts and Science	-	3	1	4
	Home Economics	1	1	0	1
	UNMC	-	2	-	2
	Fine Arts	1	1	-	2
	Continuing Studies	-	-	1	1
Number Pursuing Advanced Degrees		1	2	1	4

TABLE 1.9

SELECTED CSQ ITEMS SHOWING STUDENT RESPONSES

TOWARD THE GOODRICH PROGRAM

	College Student Questionnaire Items	Percent (N=74)
56.	Percent enjoying studies this term as much as or more than expected.	60.8
124.	Percent fairly or very satisfied with present academic standing.	63.8
126.	Percent fairly or very satisfied with the competencies and specialities of faculty.	84.5
127.	Percent perceiving choice of courses and availability of suitable facilities to be fairly or very adequate.	77.6

TABLE 1.10

RANK ORDER OF AREAS OF PERSONAL SATISFACTION

FOR GOODRICH STUDENTS

College Student Questionnaire Item 45	% Choosing Area as Most Important (N=74)
1. Self-discovery, self-insight; discovery of new interests, talents, etc.	25.0
2. Coursework in general.	16.7
3. Coursework in my major field.	12.5
4. Individual study, research, writing, art work, etc.	12.5
5. Close friendship with students.	8.3
6. Social life; dating, parties, etc.	6.9
7. Organized extracurricular activities, student government, athletics, clubs, etc.	5.6
8. "Bull-sessions" with fellow students.	1.4

TABLE 1.11

SELECTED CSQ ITEMS SHOWING STUDENT ESTIMATES OF THE CHARACTER OF THE GOODRICH PROGRAM

	College Student Questionnaire Item	Percent (N=74)
128.	Percent believing that Goodrich has fairly high or a great deal of prestige on campus.	39.6
121.	Percent believing that students in Goodrich are above average or among the brightest on campus.	73.3
71.	Percent believing that the institution is under strong or moderate pressure to offer an experience contrary to the one offered at Goodrich.	25.4
119.	Percent believing there is a moderate or strong group spirit or common identity among students.	46.6
44.	Percent believing that there is a great deal or a fair amount of competitiveness among students regarding grades.	74.8
120.	Percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that the program rewards conformity and punishes individualism.	79.0

TABLE 1.12

COMPARISON OF ALIENATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE PERCENTAGES

OF 187 GOODRICH (GDR) AND 195 NON-GOODRICH (NGDR) STUDENTS

Item		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	χ^2	p
1. The size and complexity of this University make it very difficult for a student to know where to turn.	GDR	36.9	10.2	52.9	.63	.96
	NGDR	34.0	9.8	56.2		
2. It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens within this University.	GDR	39.0	20.3	40.6	10.82	.03*
	NGDR	53.8	17.4	28.7		
3. I find that individual classes provide for the personal needs and interests of the student.	GDR	59.8	24.5	15.8	1.58	.81
	NGDR	59.8	20.6	19.6		
4. The faculty has too much control over the lives of students at this University.	GDR	24.7	24.7	50.5	7.34	.12
	NGDR	14.9	23.6	61.5		
5. The bureaucracy of this University has me confused and bewildered.	GDR	35.3	25.7	39.0	4.02	.40
	NGDR	30.9	32.0	37.1		
6. I feel that I am an integral part of this University community.	GDR	36.0	28.5	35.5	9.29	.05*
	NGDR	37.8	22.7	49.5		

*statistically significant (fewer than 5 chances in 100)

TABLE 1.12--Continued

Item		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	χ^2	p
7. Things have become so complicated within this University that I really do not understand just what is going on.	GDR NGDR	19.8 28.5	12.8 16.6	67.4 54.9	11.34	.02*
8. I seldom feel "lost" or alone within the social system of this University.	GDR NGDR	46.2 39.2	11.8 9.8	41.9 51.0	4.14	.39
9. Students are just so many cogs in the machinery of this University.	GDR NGDR	46.5 48.2	27.0 20.7	26.5 31.1	3.96	.41
10. I do not have as many friends as I would like at this University.	GDR NGDR	40.9 53.4	7.0 11.9	52.2 34.7	14.71	.01*
11. Most of the time I feel I have an effective voice in the decisions regarding my destiny at this University.	GDR NGDR	39.6 37.8	16.0 26.9	44.4 43.5	.67	.96
12. Life within the social system of this University is so chaotic that the student really does not know where to turn.	GDR NGDR	26.2 29.5	20.9 26.9	52.9 43.5	4.88	.30
13. Many students within this University are lonely and unrelated to their fellow human beings.	GDR NGDR	46.5 51.0	27.3 25.5	26.2 23.4	1.50	.83

TABLE 1.12--Continued

Item		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	χ^2	p
14. More and more, I feel helpless in the face of what is happening with this University today.	GDR	25.1	19.3	55.6	21.42	.00*
	NGDR	38.1	28.4	33.5		
15. The forces affecting me within this University are so complex and confusing that I find it difficult to effectively make decisions.	GDR	20.3	10.7	69.0	12.40	.01*
	NGDR	22.3	21.4	55.7		
16. I can't seem to make much sense out of my University experience.	GDR	12.8	13.4	73.8	4.18	.38
	NGDR	20.4	13.1	66.5		
17. My experience at this University has been devoid of any meaningful relationships.	GDR	10.3	13.0	76.6	12.68	.01*
	NGDR	22.4	15.1	62.5		
18. The administration has too much control over my life at this University.	GDR	25.8	17.7	56.5	2.69	.61
	NGDR	22.0	14.1	63.9		
19. This University is run by a few people in power and there is not much the student can do about it.	GDR	40.5	32.2	36.2	5.68	.22
	NGDR	42.4	28.8	28.8		
20. The student has little chance of protecting his personal interests when they conflict with those of this University.	GDR	43.5	26.9	29.6	1.88	.76
	NGDR	46.1	25.1	28.8		

TABLE 1.12--Continued

	Item		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	χ^2	p
21.	In spite of the fast pace of this University, it is easy to make many close friends that you can really count on.	GDR NGDR	42.9 25.1	19.6 17.3	37.5 47.6	4.82	.31
22.	My life is so confusing at this University that I hardly know what to expect from day to day.	GDR NGDR	11.9 13.8	11.9 14.3	76.2 72.0	5.56	.23
23.	In this fast changing University, with so much different information available, it is difficult to think clearly about many issues.	GDR NGDR	23.7 32.6	19.4 22.1	57.0 45.3	6.76	.15
24.	This University is just too big and impersonal to provide for the individual student.	GDR NGDR	34.1 37.2	18.9 17.3	46.0 45.5	.50	.97

TABLE 2.1

ACTIVITIES ANALYSIS OF GOODRICH

TEACHING FACULTY

	Average Hours Devoted	% of Time Devoted
Teaching	7.1	20
Advisement	6	17
Preparation & Grading	7.8	22.1
Discussion, Research & Individual Study	8.5	24.1
Meetings & Administrative Activities	5.9	16.8
Total	35.3	100

TABLE 2.2

COLLEGE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM RESPONSES

INDICATING STUDENT RECEPTIONS OF FACULTY

College Student Questionnaire Item	Percent (N=74)
73. Percent believing that all professors were competent in their own special fields.	47.3
55. Percent believing that more than half of all professors who taught them were superior teachers.	45.9
58. Percent believing that several or all professors have succeeded in challenging them to produce to the limit of intellectual and creative capacities.	52.8
72. Percent believing that most of their teachers accepted or encouraged student argument and disagreement.	75.3
74. Percent fairly to extremely satisfied with opportunities to meet instructors privately about work.	89.0
61. Percent receiving one or more evaluations from faculty which made them think that they might become a creative or productive worker in their field.	60.9
66. Percent believing that more than half their teachers came to know them by name.	75.7
67. Percent believing that over half the faculty members they have observed are genuinely interested in students and their problems.	51.4
69. Percent having a close personal relationship with one or more faculty at UNO.	69.0

TABLE 3.1

SELECTED VALUES AND ATTITUDES (CSQ) OF FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE GOODRICH STUDENTS

Percent of Goodrich Respondents Choosing Philosophy* as Descriptive of Self: Items 35-38	Freshman (N=78)	Sophomore (N=89)	Diff.
Vocational	64.0	76.0	+12
Academic	58.2	59.0	+.08
Collegiate	53.3	46.9	-5.4
Non-Conformist	28.0	18.7	-9.3
Percent expecting to continue education in graduate or professional school	56.5	69.0	+12.5

*Philosophies derived from typologies of Clark Trow. cf. description in CSQ (Appendix C)

TABLE 3.2

SELECTED ATTITUDES OF GOODRICH FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE STUDENTS

College Student Questionnaire Item	Freshman (N=77)	Sophomore (N=78)	Percent Difference
172. Percent becoming indignant upon reading that a high government official has taken money or gifts in return for favors.	41.6	32.1	-9.5
173. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that the government should have the right to prohibit certain persons who disagree with our form of government from holding peaceable public meetings.	38.1	32.5	-5.6
174. Percent feeling fairly or very strongly that something must be done soon about the rising tide of juvenile crime in this country.	47.4	51.2	+3.8
175. Percent mildly or highly concerned about the extent to which economic poverty still exists in the United States (eg. the fact that in 1966 about one-fifth of American families earned under $400 a year.	78.7	78.2	-.5
176. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that police are unduly hampered in their efforts to apprehend criminals when they have to have a warrant to search a house.	42.7	47.4	+4.7

TABLE 3.2--Continued

College Student Questionnaire Item	Freshman (N=77)	Sophomore (N=78)	Percent Difference
177. Percent mildly or highly concerned that persons who are not white-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant seem to have somewhat less opportunity in America.	80.6	84.6	+4.0
178. Percent mildly or very much disturbed about what appears to be a growing preoccupation with money and material possessions throughout this country accompanied by a declining concern for national aims, spiritual values, and other moral considerations.	78.3	70.2	-8.1
179. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that capital punishment (the death penalty) should be abolished.	70.7	76.2	+5.5
180. Percent who probably or definitely would enjoy participating in, or listening to, a discussion of philosophies of history.	61.3	57.3	-4.0
181. Percent mildly or highly concerned about the many elderly people in the U.S. who are left alone to live "on crumbs of welfare measures".	69.7	79.8	+8.7
182. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that the government should do more than it is presently doing to see that everyone gets adequate medical care.	72.6	81.3	+8.7

TABLE 3.2--Continued

College Student Questionnaire Item	Freshman (N=77)	Sophomore (N=78)	Percent Difference
183. Percent occasionally or quite frequently discussing foreign films with your acquaintances.	22.4	28.2	+5.8
184. Percent quite interested or very much interested in modern art.	55.9	25.3	-30.6
185. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that legislative committees should not investigate the political beliefs of college or university faculty members.	65.0	61.5	-3.5
186. Percent mildly upset or very much upset at the sight of children looking at obscene printed material at a magazine stand or elsewhere.	77.6	78.4	+.8
188. Percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that labor unions these days are doing the country more harm than good.	34.3	45.1	+10.8
190. Percent deriving pleasure from listening to good live performances of classical music.	47.4	59.3	+11.9
191. Percent mildly or greatly disturbed when hearing of confessions of extensive rigging of bids or rigging of "administering" of prices in some essential industry in the U.S.	31.6	46.8	+15.2

TABLE 3.2--Continued

College Student Questionnaire Item	Freshman (N=77)	Sophomore (N=78)	Percent Difference
192. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that conscientious objectors should be excused from military service in wartime.	64.0	67.1	+3.1
193. Percent feeling mildly shocked or highly outraged when first hearing about a lynching somewhere in the U.S. (which happened as recently as 1959)--to a man named Parker.	60.0	74.1	+14.1
194. Percent agreeing or strongly agreeing with the contention that the welfare state tends to destroy individual initiative.	42.1	41.3	-.8
195. Percent enjoying very much or to some extent reading poetry.	54.7	68.3	+13.6
196. Percent knowing a moderate amount or a good deal about the history of painting.	54.0	34.6	-19.4
197. Percent having gone to an evening lecture on some serious topic (other than required lectures) more than 3 or 4 times in the past year.	25.3	15.0	-10.3
198. Percent owning more than 30 serious books.	25.3	15.0	-10.3

TABLE 3.2--Continued

College Student Questionnaire Item	Freshman (N=77)	Sophomore (N=78)	Percent Difference
199. Percent having reacted to some of art (eg., a painting, sculpture, musical performance) with deep and intense personal feeling.	60.0	56.1	-3.9
200. Percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that individual liberties and justice under law are not possible in socialist countries.	20.0	40.3	+20.3

TABLE 4.1

CURRENT COLLEGE AFFILIATION OF GOODRICH STUDENTS (IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY)

	Frequency	Percent
Education	46	29.1
Arts & Sciences	38	24.1
Business Administration	26	16.5
Public Affairs & Community Service	17	10.8
University Division	10	6.3
Fine Arts	8	5.1
Engineering	6	3.8
Continuing Studies	6	3.8
Non-Degree	1	.6
Total	158	

TABLE 4.2

COMPARATIVE EXPENDITURES OF GOODRICH PROGRAM,

UNO, AND NATIONAL AVERAGE

Expenditures per Full-Time Resident Student (in dollars)	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Goodrich	2722	1836	1628	1753	1892
UNO	1026	1021	1200	1287	1424
National Avg.*	(NA)	(NA)	2760	2547	(NA)

*U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1976.

APPENDIX C

GOODRICH GRADUATES

INFORMATION ON GOODRICH GRADUATES

DEGREE	COLLEGE	PRESENT ACTIVITY
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS*
Bach. of General Studies	Continuing Studies	Cameraman, WOWTV
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	Probation Officer--Nebraska State
Bach. of Arts	Arts & Sciences	(Unknown)
Bach. of Sci. Bus. Admin.	Business Admin.	Accountant--Majers Research Inc.
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS*
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Grad. Assistant--Goodrich Program
Bach. of Fine Arts	Fine Arts	Teaching Music--Niobrara, Nebr.
Bach. of Sci. Bus. Admin.	Business Admin.	Asst. Manager--K-Mart
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Substitute Teacher
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Unemployed
Bach. of Sci. in Pub. Admin.	CPACS	Caseworker--Douglas County Health Dept.
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	Grad. Assistant--Goodrich Program
Bach. of Fine Arts	Fine Arts	Grad. Assistant--Goodrich Program
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	(Unknown)
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	Paralegal Asst. for Legal Aid of Nebr.

*Omaha Public Schools

DEGREE	COLLEGE	PRESENT ACTIVITY
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	Youth Worker--Park View Shelter Care
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	2nd Year Law School--Creighton Univ.
Bach. of Science	Arts & Sciences	Lab Work--Cudahy Packing Co.
Bach. of Sci. Urban Studies	CPACS	Researcher--City of Council Bluffs, Ia.
Bach. of Science	Arts & Sciences	(Unknown)
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS* (Deceased)
Bach. of Science	UNMC	Medical Technologist--UNMC**
Bach. of Sci. Bus. Admin.	Business Admin.	Computer Research Dept. Northern Natural Gas
Bach. of Science	UNMC	Medical Technologist--UNMC**
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	(Unknown)
Bach. of Science	Home Economics	Interior Design--Davis, Wegener Assoc.
Bach. of Sci. in Crim. Jus.	CPACS	Seasonal Forest Ranger Yellowstone Nat'l Park
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS*
Bach. of Sci. Bus. Admin.	Business Admin.	Group Leader--N.W. Computer Service, Sioux Falls, S.D.
Bach. of Science Masters of Social Work	CPACS Graduate College	Social Worker--Villa de Sante Nursing Home
Bach. of Science	CPACS	Teacher--5th Grade--Bellevue, Nebr.
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Substitute Teacher--Bellevue & Dist. 66

*Omaha Public Schools
**University of Nebraska Medical Center

DEGREE	COLLEGE	PRESENT ACTIVITY
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS*
Bach. of Sci. Soc. Welfare	CPACS	Social Worker--Omaha Home for Girls
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Teacher, OPS*
Bach. of Sci. Bus. Admin.	Business Admin.	Insurance Dept.--Northern Natural Gas
Bach. of Sci. in Education	Education	Secretary--Bellevue Public Schools
Bach. of Science	Arts & Sciences	Advertising Dept.--Brandeis Store
Bach. of Sci. Urban Studies	CPACS	Librarian--UNL*** Graduate Student--Public Admin.

*Omaha Public Schools
***University of Nebraska at Lincoln

APPENDIX D

DEVELOPMENTAL PLAN OF COUNSELING SERVICES

DEVELOPMENTAL PLAN OF COUNSELING SERVICES FOR

GOODRICH SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM 1977-78

In view of the increased student enrollment in the Goodrich Scholarship Program beginning in the fall semester of 1977 the need for a full time counselor is greater than ever before. The Goodrich Program was designed to serve a special population, a population that for all intents and purposes has been previously denied access to a college education. A review of programs similar to the Goodrich Program brings to the forefront some definite counseling services as essential to the success of the non-traditional college student. A research study (Fair, 1973, Journal of Non-White Concerns, July 1976) was done in which "components and practices were ranked in the order of importance to special programs for disadvantaged students, as reported by directors." In this study, special counseling ranked second, behind special tutoring. The Goodrich Program has a full-time staff person working in the area of study skills services as well as a faculty person devoting partial time to this endeavor. A full-fledged counseling service would compliment this aspect of our program as well as supplement counseling services of the larger university.

What follows is a developmental plan to provide the appropriate services to our students based on indications of their needs. Many of the problems faced by our students are exaggerated by the fact that UNO is a large, urban, commuter campus which fosters a sense of alienation, especially among minority and low-income students. The plans presented here are meant to meet the needs of those students, they are flexible and should serve as guidelines for the year not as a strict operational manual.

July--Freshmen Orientation--Academic Advisement

Objective:

1. To provide an initial contact for the student with the program. This human contact is meant to alleviate the "coldness" of the registration process and to identify the Goodrich Program as a place to come for assistance.

2. To control for number of hours; Goodrich freshmen should register for at least 12 hours but not more than 15 hours the first semester.

3. To insure that new students get registered for the required Goodrich classes, as well as the appropriate courses for their respective majors.

August 22--Goodrich Introductory Meeting for Freshmen

Objective: 1. Introduction and first informal contact with the faculty and staff at Goodrich. This sets the pace for continual and follow-up contacts.

2. The student will receive basic information about the program and the university. This includes any last minute preparation for the first day of classes.

3. There will be an interpersonal session for students to introduce themselves and get acquainted with each other. This is to eliminate the lost feeling often experienced by students who may otherwise spend their first days on campus without seeing a familiar face.

September 28--Open House for High School Counselors

Objective: 1. Directly involve persons who will be referring students to the Program with the Program.

2. Inform the counselors of the objectives and operations of the Program.

3. Increase communication between the Goodrich Program and the community.

First Semester--Communication Labs--One hour per week for 6-8 weeks, small groups of 6 groups of 8 students

Objective: 1. Development of a sense of trust and belongingness. Interaction is important to human growth and through discussion and planned activities the students will be encouraged to evaluate themselves and make positive changes.

2. Provide basic rules and procedural information about the university for the student.

3. A time for goal setting and values clarification for the students.

A study done by Bonnie T. Dill on "Group Counseling and Communication Skills" compared two groups of college students admitted to CUNY (City University of New York). One group was part of a program with similarities to the Goodrich Program and the other group was comprised of students not in the program but who have some of the same characteristics. The conclusion of the study indicated "In both cases, group counseling contributed to an improvement in student morale, not only by allowing the students to ventilate their annoyances and

frustrations, but by helping them to critically analyze their study skills and their strengths and weaknesses as college students, to develop their own criteria for good work, and to see the relationship of communication skills to their total college plans. Thus it seems that group counseling is an important component of the Communication Skills program and that the counselor, as La Fausi (1970) points out, can add much to the team-teaching effort" (Journal of Non-White Concerns, July 1976).

First Semester--Individual Personal Conferences--Follow up to Communications Lab

Objective:

1. By being able to go directly to the Goodrich classes it will be possible to identify and seek out those students who may be having problems but who otherwise would be reluctant to visit the university counseling center.

2. To continue any individual personal concerns and value clarification projects that may have surfaced during communications lab.

3. To schedule an initial conference for each Goodrich student with a member of the faculty or staff. All contacts must be "logged" and an indication made as to the need for additional meetings. (See blue card)

First Semester--Academic Planning Day--November

Objective:

1. To reach all students before registration for second semester and to make appropriate scheduling plans with them.

2. To involve all faculty directly in the college careers of their students.

3. To assist students in the planning of their academic progress over the long term.

Ongoing Activities Throughout the Year--Individual Conferences re Academic Advisement of Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors by Faculty

Objective:

1. Provides follow-up to the scheduled Academic Planning Day in November.

2. Provide information re deadlines to remove Incompletes, when to file for degree candidacy, possibilities for after graduation, degree requirements, etc.

3. Maintain contact with students not participating in Goodrich classes.

Ongoing--"On-the-spot" Counseling

Objective: 1. To respond to the immediate needs of the students. Asking the student to make an appointment to come in next week may be too late.

2. To provide special techniques for dealing with the culturally different and to relate to minority group experiences and uniqueness.

3. To use strategies and methods that will be beneficial to the client's immediate needs and also to provide a basis for follow-up sessions. Premature termination is a problem which seems to develop when the client senses a lack of concern or awareness on the part of the counselor.

Ongoing--Development of Referral System with Other University Agencies

Objective: 1. To break ground for the student who often sees offices "across campus" as being for the white, middle-class student. By talking with the student beforehand and perhaps making the appointment for him/her, some of the feelings of alienation can be eliminated.

2. To provide information to the other offices, (Counseling & Testing, Academic Resource Center, Reading Improvement Lab, etc.) about the Goodrich Program and our students. This will give them a chance to provide communication and feedback re our services and our students.

Ongoing--Job Referral Service

Objective: 1. To seek out employers and locate jobs mostly on a part-time basis for students.

2. To make available to all Goodrich students information on job openings around the community.

3. To identify and counsel those students who need financial assistance and whose class load will permit them to work.

One Each Semester--Financial Aid Workshop--The majority of our students need financial assistance beyond what Goodrich provides. There is no such thing as a "free ride" with the Goodrich Program.

Objective: 1. To provide instructions on procedural matters in applying for financial aid.

2. To provide instructions on filling out the forms correctly.

3. To inform students of filing deadlines.

Second Semester--Resumes and Interviewing Workshops--This can be done in conjunction with the Placement Center.

Objective: 1. To prepare graduating seniors for entry into the job market.

2. To inform them of the correct way of preparing credentials.

3. To allow students an opportunity to role-play and examine an interview situation.

Second Semester--Career Information Workshop--This can be in conjunction with the Career Development Center, in a variety of areas: the Natural Sciences, Business, Engineering, Education, Social Services, etc.

Objective: 1. To inform students as to "where the jobs are."

2. To explore the variety of careers available in a given area, such as Business.

3. To establish the career goals of the individual to be congruent with his/her personal values.

Second Semester--Rap Sessions on a variety of subjects, including Human Sexuality, Single Parents, Coping with Anxiety and Stress, and The Human Change Process, plus other topics recommended by students. Ernest Woods, Jr., reports in his article "Counseling Minority Students" (Personnel and Guidance Journal, March 1977) "that Ethnic Awareness Groups provided a means for minority students to rap, share information and develop support systems with each other that could not be achieved in a white dominated group."

Objective: 1. To provide a chance for students to have input into the counseling services of the program.

2. To develop awareness of one's own limitations, problems, and potential.

3. To develop a healthy attitude to change and self-awareness.

REFERENCES

Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate the Goodrich Program, Final Report, 1977.

Chickering, Arthur, Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Cross, K. Patricia. Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Feldman, Kenneth and Newcomb, Theodore. The Impact of College Upon Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Goodrich Scholarship Program, Self-Study, Spring 1976.

University of Nebraska at Omaha, Self-Study for Accreditation Review, 1976.

Weathersby, George. Institutional Versus Student Aid. In Vermilye, Dyckman (ed.), Individualizing the System. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977, pp. 118-129.